



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





**STANFORD
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES**





12/26

THE
English Catholic Library.

VOLUME THE FIRST.

A SEARCH
MADE INTO
MATTERS OF RELIGION:

BY
FRANCIS WALSINGHAM.



SAINT GEORGE PRAY FOR ENGLAND.

LONDON:
CHARLES DOLMAN, 61, NEW BOND STREET.

MDCCCXLIII.

ADVERTISEMENT

FROM

THE PUBLISHER.

WHEN it is recollected that, at the present time, the most unceasing attacks are made upon our holy religion through the medium of the press, and that a Society* has been formed, which is now in active operation, for the avowed purpose of republishing the writings of FRITH, TINDAL, CRANMER, LATIMER, RIDLEY, JEWELL, RAINOLDS, PARKER, FULKE, FOX, and many others of the English sectaries,—it becomes an imperative duty upon Catholics to meet these attacks in the most effectual manner, by reproducing the masterly and triumphant replies of Sir THOMAS MORE, BISHOPS FISHER, GARDINER, CARDINAL ALLEN, HARDING, STAPLETON, SANDERS, BRISTOW, PERSONS, WALSINGHAM, and others, written in defence of our holy religion, and most admirably calculated to counteract the evil effects which the dissemination of sectarian writings is likely to produce. In presenting the first volume of the ENGLISH CATHOLIC LIBRARY to the world, the publisher ventures to express a hope that his

* The Parker Society, numbering nearly *seven thousand* subscribers.

ADVERTISEMENT.

efforts to revive the sterling works of the defenders of our holy faith, during the past ages of trial and persecution, will meet with that support from the Catholic body which will enable him to carry on these *republications* to the extent originally proposed; for which purpose he respectfully solicits all persons who may be desirous of supporting the undertaking to forward their names to him, at 61, New Bond Street, London, either direct, or through the medium of their booksellers.

The Second Volume will contain,

SHORT AND PLAIN WAY TO THE CHURCH,

Composed many years since by that eminent Divine Mr. RICHARD HUDDLESTON, of the English Congregation, of the order of St. BENEDICT; to which is annexed King Charles II.'s papers, found in his closet—with an account of what occurred on his death-bed in regard to religion;—and a summary of occurrences relating to his miraculous preservation after the defeat of his army at Worcester. Published by his Nephew, Mr. JOHN HUDDLESTON, Priest of the same congregation.

NAMES OF SUBSCRIBERS

ALREADY RECEIVED.

The Earl of Arundel and Surrey.
The Earl of Shrewsbury.
The Most Reverend Dr. MacHale, Archbishop of Tuam.
The Right Honourable Lord Camoys.
The Right Honourable Lord Stourton.
The Right Reverend Dr. Griffiths, V.A.L.
The Right Reverend Dr. Gillis.
The Right Reverend Dr. Healy, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.
The Right Reverend Dr. Wiseman.
The Right Reverend Dr. T. J. Brown, V.A., Wales.
The Right Reverend Dr. Willson.
The Honourable Edward Petre.
The Honourable Mrs. Edward Petre.
The Honourable Charles Thomas Clifford.
The Honourable Henry Stafford Jerningham.
The Honourable William Stafford Jerningham.

Abbot, Rev. Joseph, Birmingham.
Alberry, Rev. Joseph, Winchester.
Applegath, Rev. A., Crayford.
Aston, —, Esq.

Bagshawe, H. R., Esq.
Ball, Rev. John, Doncaster.
Bent, Rev. George, West Bromwich.
Blundell, T. Weld, Esq.
Bond, Rev. William, Chidcock, Dorsetshire.
Boothman, Thomas, Jun., Esq.

NAMES OF SUBSCRIBERS ALREADY RECEIVED.

Bourchier, Alfred, Esq. Two Copies.
Brewer, Rev. Henry, O.S.B., Brown Edge, Preston.
Buckley, Mr. Thomas.
Butterly, Thomas, Esq.
Byron, Rev. L. S., Christchurch.

Carter, Rev. John, Woolston, Lancashire.
Casey, Rev. William, Marnhull.
Catholicon.
Chamberlain, R. D., Esq.
Chambers, Miss L.
City of London Catholic Literary Society. Two Copies.
Clarke, G. N., Esq.
Clough, Rev. James, Pylewell.
Coombes, Rev. Dr., Shepton Mallett.
Costigan, Rev. Thomas, Margate.
Coverdale, Mr. James.
Cox, Rev. Dr., St. Edmund's College.
Curr, Rev. Joseph, Blackburn.

Dallow, Mr. W. A.
Dames, Mr.
Davis, R. F., Esq.
Day, Miss M.
Dugdale, Rev. Joseph, Stockton-on-Tees.
Dullard, Rev. James, St. Benedict's Priory.

Egan, Rev. Eugene, Shrewsbury.

Finney, John, Esq.
Firebrace, Hon. Judge, Demerara.
Fisher, Rev. Joseph C., Hazlewood Hall.
Fisher, Rev. William, York.
Fitzpatrick, R. W., Esq.
Fletcher, Rev. Dr., Leamington.
Forster, Edward, Esq.
Foxhall, E. M., Esq.

NAMES OF SUBSCRIBERS ALREADY RECEIVED.

Gaffney, Rev. M., Dean of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

Gladding, Mr. Two Copies.

Gradwell, Rev. Henry, Claughton, Garstang.

Hansom, Joseph, Esq.

Hearne, Rev. Daniel, Manchester.

Hog, Thomas, Esq.

Hogarth, Rev. Robert, Burton Constable.

Hogarth, Rev. William, Darlington.

Houlgrave, Mr.

Huddleston, Rev. Edward, Stafford.

Husenbeth, Rev. F. C., Cossey.

Hussey, John, Esq.

Hutton, Rev. P., Prior Park.

Ilsley, Rev. William, Baddesley.

Jackson, Mr.

Jauch, Rev. J., German Chapel.

Jefferies, Rev. George, Birmingham.

Jenkins, Rev. John, Cheltenham.

Jones, Mr. Thomas.

Keane, D. D., Esq.

Keane, Mr. James.

Kelly, Rev. Matthew, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

Kendal, John, Esq.

Kerr, John, Esq.

Last, Rev. George, Ingatestone Hall.

Lawlor, Denis Shine, Esq.

Lee, Rev. Walter, D.D., St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

Leek, Mr. W. T.

Leigh, Mr.

Lescher, William, Esq.

Lomax, Edmund, Esq.

Lynch, Mr.

NAMES OF SUBSCRIBERS ALREADY RECEIVED.

M'Cormick, Rev. Hugh, St. Austin's, Manchester.
M'Donnell, Rev. Thomas, Torquay.
Maguire, Rev. Dr., Bavarian Chapel.
Maguire, Rev. Alfred, Hethe, Bicester.
Macpherson, Mr.
Martin, Thomas, Esq.
Maxwell, Henry, Esq.
Maxwell, Joseph, Esq.
Metcalf, Rev. Edward, Newport, Monmouthshire.
Meyer, Mr. James.
Moore, Thomas Arthur O'Donnell, Esq.
Morgan, G. R., Esq.
Munk, Dr.
Murray, Rev. P. A., St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

Neve, Mrs.
Newcastle-on-Tyne Catholic Religious Defence Society.

O'Connell, Daniel, Esq., M.P.
O'Connell, Rev. Daniel, Ardara, County Donegal.
O'Reilly, Rev. Edmund, D.D., St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.
Orrell, Rev. Philip, Poulton-in-the-Fylde.

Patterson, W. F., Esq.
Peyton, Miss.
Phillips, Rev. Henry, Tichborne.
Pugin, A. Welby, Esq.

Rees, John, Esq.
Render, Rev. Joseph, Hull.
Richards, Mr.
Riddell, Rev. William, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Ritchie, E., Esq.
Robertson, Mrs.
Rock, Rev. Dr., Buckland.
Russell, Rev. C. W., St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.
Rymer, Mr.

NAMES OF SUBSCRIBERS ALREADY RECEIVED.

Scoles, James, Esq.
Scott, Ernest, Esq.
Sibthorp, Rev. R. Waldo, Birmingham.
Sing, Rev. Thomas, Derby.
Smith, Rev. Robert, Haggerston Castle.
Stasiewicz, Rev. Gregory, Gravesend.

Talbot, William, Esq.
Thompson, Rev. William, Esh Laude.
Tierney, Rev. M. A., F.R.S., F.S.A., Arundel.
Tilt, Rev. John, Sheerness.
Triebner, J. F., Esq., F.S.A.
Trovell, Rev. Michael, Salter's Hall.
Turnbull, W. B. D. D., Esq.
Tysack, B. G., Esq.

Ullathorne, Richard, Esq.

Vitta, Mr. A. Two Copies.

Wackerbarth, F. D., Esq.
Walmesley, Rev. Henry, Leeds.
Walker, Rev. John, Scarborough.
Warrington Catholic Library.
Ward, Rev. Percival, Compton Valence.
Waterworth, Rev. J., Newark.
White, Mr. William.
Wilcock, Thomas, Esq.

Wilds, Rev. William, Bavarian Chapel.
Wilson, Rev. Joseph St. Gregory's College.
Williams, R., Esq.

Young, Miss

Printed by J. L. Cox & Sons, 74 & 75, Great Queen Street,
Lincoln's-Inn Fields.

PREFACE

TO THE

PRESENT EDITION.

THE faithful record of a mind's struggles for satisfaction on "matters of religion" is obviously both interesting and instructive. It is a chapter in the history of providence: manifesting the operation of those secondary agencies which God is pleased to employ; indicating the eventual importance of that apparently trivial occurrence or casual suggestion which gave the first impulse to the inquirer; disclosing the stratagems which the spirit of error contrived, to retain him in bondage and frustrate the inspirations of heaven in his regard; and verifying, in the issue resulting from his sincere, dispassionate, and uncompromising investigations, the declaration of Holy Writ, that God is a reward to them that diligently seek Him. The truth which we possess is the more endeared to our hearts by our witnessing the toilsome exertions which it has cost others to compass it; and a salutary lesson of Christian forbearance and charity towards the erring may be read, in beholding the tenacity with which prejudice clings to the honest mind, and the hard wrestling it must undergo ere it can disengage itself from the notions which education has linked around it.

This species of autobiography will always have its uses ; in some instances it may be eminently profitable. Put the case of a man whose embracing of the truth involves the sacrifice of considerable interests ; a man slow to be convinced that a body of men universally decried could be otherwise than deserving of the infamy by common consent attaching to their very name ; a man of inquiring temper but of equally strong prejudices, who, if he engages in research and admits the accused to a hearing, listens at the same time most eagerly to whatever is calculated to abate the force of the justification, who, being thrown almost exclusively into the society of declared enemies of that cause into whose pretensions he is investigating, consents most readily to examine all the criminatory evidence they are pleased to adduce, who hopes to find the right on that side where common opinion proclaims it, where his education teaches him to believe it to be, and where his interests flatter him that it really is,—suppose this man, after exerting himself with equal effort to confirm himself in his early convictions and to probe the reasons calling upon him to resign them, to lay open in circumstantial detail and with ingenuous sincerity all his fluctuations, doubts, and perplexities, to record the influence which each argument and motive excited in his mind, to repass the whole history of his search into matters of religion ; his narrative must not only be fraught with interest, but richly instructive. It will furnish a clue to those who are bewildered in the labyrinth whence he happily found an issue. It is a master-key to religious controversy furnished by a deep thinker and a scholar. Such was the man to whom the reader is now to be introduced.

FRANCIS WALSINGHAM was born in Northumberland, in the year 1576. By the care of his kinsman, Humphrey Walsingham, a citizen of London—a care undertaken at

the request of a common relative, Sir Francis, Secretary of State to Queen Elizabeth—he was educated at St. Paul's School, London. From this school he proceeded to Cambridge, and subsequently received deacon's orders at the hands of the Bishop of Ely. How, by the perusal of a work of the Jesuit, Father Robert Persons, he was led to examine into the controversies of the times, and by what singularly laborious process of inquiry he arrived at the conviction upon which he subsequently acted, the reader will learn from his own circumstantial and deeply interesting narrative, which must not here be anticipated. In 1606, having previously embraced the religion of his forefathers, he proceeded to Rome, and entered upon a course of study in that city. Three years later, he joined the Society of Jesus; and, in 1615, returned to the land of his birth as a missionary. In 1618, his work, entitled "Some Reasons for embracing the Catholic Faith," was printed in London. "The Search" had already been printed in Belgium nine years before. "He laboured in the mission," says the English Church historian, Dodd,* "thirty-two years, with singular zeal and edification to his neighbour. He was a person well skilled in controversial matters; and discovered his parts in several conferences with divines of the Church of England. But his chief employment was conversing with persons of an inferior rank, and instructing children. He died July 1, 1647, aged 71."

To this short biographical sketch it may be allowed to add a few words on the authorship and the distinctive character of the work which bears this venerable man's name on its title-page. On the first point all observation would have been superfluous, had not the learned Mr. Oliver, in his "Collections towards illustrating the Biography of

* Vol. ii. p. 409, folio ed.

the Scotch, English, and Irish members S. J.," strongly intimated a doubt upon the subject, and even distinctly ascribed the work to Father Persons.* Mr. Oliver grounds himself on the following "note made at Rome, about the year 1690;" that is, about eighty years after the death of Persons, and forty-three after that of Walsingham:—

"In the library of the English College at Rome it is placed among Father Persons's works, by *him* who procured all the other books of this father to be bound in more handsome fashion, with the letters R. P., in gold, on each side of the covers, and conserved in the library of that college, under lock and key."

But it may reasonably be asked, whether a question of authorship can be thus summarily decided against the presumptive evidence furnished in the title-page, by a bare reference to the judgment of one with whose means of information, and with whose very name, we are unacquainted? Rumour, conjecture, caprice, or envy, will be found in many instances active in disturbing an author's most undoubted title.† Indeed, the error of the collector

* "It is *more than probable* that the immortal work, which passes under (Walsingham's) name "A Search made," &c., was written by Father Persons, then Rector of the English College at Rome, where Walsingham was then studying, and whence he went that very year to enter the Society." P. 198. At p. 148, Mr. Oliver says definitively, "(Persons) *was* also the author of 'A Search,' &c."

† Most readers of the treatise *De Synodo Diocesana* will recollect how circumstantially the author of that invaluable work relates, in his preface, the history of its composition: how he speaks of the preparing of materials for it at Bologna, of the interruption occasioned by a summons to the Conclave of 1740, of the resuming of the undertaking, after some interval engrossed by the issuing of a Bullarium and other extensive works, and its prosecution amidst all the distractions of the Pontificate, of its publication in 1753, and of its subsequent enlargement and improvement. They will also recollect the closing declaration of the writer, that he addresses the theological world not

who included the book before us in his complete set of Persons's works may be convincingly ascertained by any one who will compare its style with that of the "Three Conversions."

Waving, however, the argument from internal evidence, we meet Mr. Oliver with positive testimony. The statement of Allegambe,* who wrote whilst Walsingham was living, need not be insisted on, for we have more conclusive evidence furnished in the Annual Letters of the Roman College for the year 1609; where it is expressly stated "that Walsingham was the author of the work in question; that he had commenced it before he went to Rome; that he finished it at intervals during his stay there, and that, having subsequently removed to Belgium, he there retouched and printed it." *Romam venit, ibique peractis studiis, sacrisque initiatus, librum de tota conversionis serie, cujus aliqua antea capita collegerat, secumque Romam attulerat, subsecivis horis absolvit; et in Belgium discedens ibidem perpolivit, et prælo dedit.*† This, of course, decides the question.

with the authority of a Pope, but in the capacity of a canonist and divine. And yet we read the following astounding statement, in a letter written from Rome, by a clergyman of the name of Thorpe. (Father Alexander Leslie) "had a principal hand in compiling those works which have made our Father Azevedo's name so famous . . . *But that trick hath been practised by greater men: for it is well known to several that the late Father Julii composed the Treatise De Synodo Diocesana, which is greatly esteemed among the works of Benedict XIV.*" (Collect. p. 11.) Mr. Oliver is not held responsible for the assertions contained in the letters which he prints in his biographical sketches:—still it is to be regretted that he should have suffered this to pass without suitable reprehension. It is probably the first time that the ingenuous character of Prosper Lambertini has been impeached, and that the paltry vanity of strutting in borrowed plumes has been ascribed to the first scholar and most generous patron of learning in the eighteenth century.

* P. 142. ad hanc diem superstes in Anglia.

† MS. in possession of Rev. M. A. Tierney.

The work will be found to sustain that character which Dodd has given its author, and to bespeak an amiable man no less than a well-read and acute divine. It is an exemplification of the meekness of wisdom and truth speaking in love. The Protestant reader need apprehend no vague invective, sophistic misrepresentation, or guileful evasions in these pages. Unquestionably, many of his preconceived and cherished opinions, whether on men, on facts, or on doctrines, are there combated; but with those legitimate appliances only which beseeem the good fight of faith,—candid statement, honest allegation of authorities, diligent comparison of testimonies, fair reasoning on sound premises. It is not a polemic that addresses him, but an expositor; one who, having long and conscientiously toiled in search of the truth, points out in detail where he met with embarrassment, where he found assistance; one who correctly estimates from his own experience the difficulties which beset the inquiry, and who, in his course of friendly instruction, the simple record of his own process, leaves no objection unanswered, and advances nothing which he does not immediately prove.

Such is the work which ushers in "THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC LIBRARY," a projected selection of our standard doctrinal and practical writers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Being a review of the principal authors, Catholic and Protestant, that appeared in the reigns of James the First, and his predecessor, Elizabeth, it furnishes an insight into the controversies of the age, which will be found to have its uses at the present day; and it moreover exhibits, in the concluding chapters, the method which the Catholic Church employs for the advancement of the souls of her children in the knowledge of God, and *the renewal of the inward man.*

A word or two in reference to the present edition. The text of the second and somewhat enlarged edition, printed by the author in 1615, has been followed throughout, with no other change than the substitution of the modern orthography, and the correction of mere typographical errors.* What is not found in the text of the first edition is printed within brackets: what is found in that edition, but omitted in the second, is reproduced at the foot of the page. The variations and additions are not considerable; but the exhibiting and specifying of them have been deemed desirable, to put the reader in possession of both editions in conjunction.

Thus far as to the text. On almost every point of importance the author's quotations have been confronted with the writers to whom he appeals, and the examination has furnished very satisfactory evidence of his habitual carefulness and accuracy. The notation adopted in more modern and more accessible editions of the fathers has often been substituted for that which appears in the margin of the old copy: an alteration which, whilst it is the guarantee of correctness in a particular instance, will facilitate any investigation which the reader may be disposed to undertake. To obviate all cavil, and to clear

* Whilst the work was passing through the press, it was suggested that umbrage might be given by the retaining of certain extracts from the writings of the Reformers; and that it would be advisable to expunge them. The suggestion was not followed, *first*, because it is to be hoped that the apprehension is ungrounded. *Secondly*, because the passages alluded to amount indeed to little more than a page, but to have suppressed them would have been acting against the engagement made to print the work un mutilated and unaltered. *Thirdly*, because the omission might have been interpreted into a confession that the imputations on the morality of the Reformers were calumnious. The fact is, that the imputations are indisputably true: in whatever light the modern Protestant may regard the argument which Catholic writers have thence deduced, applying the divine rule—"By their fruits ye shall know them."

up an occasional obscurity, the Latin and Greek originals have frequently been cited at length. The elucidation of the author's meaning, the explanation of obsolete words, the rectification of historical mistakes, have not been neglected. No observed inaccuracy has been dissembled: error being more mischievous when it receives the countenance of a respectable name, should always be deprived of that patronage. Finally, where an interesting subject is incidentally glanced at in the text, writers who have treated it more fully have been indicated, and the attention of the reader has occasionally been directed to the applicability of the author's remarks to the controversial writers of our time. The additional notes are printed within brackets.

This preface cannot be more appropriately concluded than by the expression of a hope that the present work (and those that are to follow it) will revive in the minds of British Catholics just feelings of veneration and gratitude towards the great men who fought the great fight of faith, under disadvantages which we in our present position can but inadequately estimate, and bequeathed unto after-times such a rich store of saving knowledge; that it will induce our separated brethren to reconsider the grounds of their estrangement from the inheritors of the old faith which these men taught, and for which several of them bled; in fine, that these good books may serve to advance that desirable consummation for which we pray—our all coming into one, and being perfected in the same mind and same understanding.

Feast of St. Gregory the Great, 1843.

A
S E A R C H
MADE INTO MATTERS
OF RELIGION,

BY
FRANCIS WALSINGHAM

Deacon of the Protestants Church, before his
Change to the Catholike.

W H E R E I N

Is related, how first he fell into his doubts : And how for finall resolution thereof he repaired vnto his Maiesty, who remitted him to the L. of *Canterbury*, and he to other learned men. And what the issue was of all those Conferences.

A N D

How after this againe he betooke himselfe to the reading of Protestant and Catholike Authors, for better finding out the truth: As also for discerning where, & on what side true or false dealing was to be found: and what the successe of this Search hath byn.

Dedicated to the King's most Excellent Ma.^{ty}

T H E S E C O N D E D I T I O N .

Matth. 7. Vers. 7.

Quærite, & inuenietis. Search, and you shall find.

¶ Permissu Superiorum. Anno M. D C. X V.

THE

MAINE INTO MATTERS OF RELIGION

BY HENRY W. HARRIS

OF THE
CHURCH OF THE

NEW ENGLAND

THE FIRST PART OF THE
SERIES OF LECTURES
GIVEN AT THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ENGLAND

IN THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ENGLAND
IN THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ENGLAND

IN THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ENGLAND

IN THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ENGLAND

THE

CHURCH OF THE

CHURCH OF THE

TO THE
KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

It is now almost ten years, dread Sovereign, since making recourse unto your Majesty for comfort of my conscience in certain doubts and perplexities of mind, which, by reading a Catholic book, I had conceived; I was remitted by the clemency of your Majesty unto my Lord of Canterbury* that then was, with order to give me satisfaction. And forsomuch as many things have passed in this affair since that time, wherewith I presuppose your princely Majesty hath not been acquainted, nor doth know of the small satisfaction which I have received; I thought it a point of my loyal duty, and not ungrateful to your royal benignity to yield some particular account what hath been done in the business, and what success it hath had; hoping that your Highness will not be offended that, after due search and painful inquisition made on my behalf, and finding that which here in this book is set down, I took the resolution which I judged to be most secure for my soul's health and everlasting life in the world to come.

2. Almighty God knoweth, in whose presence I speak, that if by any search I could have found out in all this time but any one sure ground on the Protestants' behalf

* Dr. Bancroft, now dead.

whereon to rest my salvation with any probable security, I should never have yielded to any change, all worldly reasons under heaven persuading me to the contrary, as friends, kindred, country, advancement, former education, and the rest; but I confess, that not finding this, the consideration of eternity struck deeply into me, hope and fear of endless future life did work effectually with me. For having descried so great unsincerity in so many your Majesty's chief and principal learned ministers, as in this Search I have discovered, and hereupon considered with myself how undoubtedly true it is that God's most holy truth and sacred verity of Christian religion hath no necessity (but abhorreth rather) to be founded, defended, or supported by such sinister and concised means; I began to distrust and suspect that it was not God's truth, which was thus maintained, nor the saving verity which with these men I had learned.

3. And, therefore, at length, dread Sovereign, after much travail and study herein, being compassed with a cloud of witnesses, so many ancient and most learned holy fathers and doctors of Christ's Church, now saints in heaven, and embarked on the forcible stream and current of all venerable antiquity, persuading me to believe them; I was constrained (notwithstanding all resistance of flesh and blood) to make earnest suit upon my knees to be received into the only saving ark of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, *ad quam perfidia non potest habere accessum*, as I learned of that holy bishop and martyr St. Cyprian,* and out of which church the most holy father and learned doctor St. Augustine † assured me there was no hope of salvation.

* Cypr. ep. 55, ad Cornel. Papam.

† August. tom. 9, l. 4, de Symbolo, c. 13, and ep. 50, ad Bonifac.

4. I will not here take upon me to be a suitor unto your Royal Highness for some indifferent trial of this truth between your Majesty's learned Catholics and Protestants, by a free and public disputation (so many years desired, though never yet obtained); for that I must confess myself destitute of those requisite talents wherewith so many your Majesty's learned subjects are furnished, which would readily undergo that charge. But might it only please your princely wisdom (imitating herein that memorable example of the Most Christian King in granting that public* trial between the Bishop of Evreux (now cardinal) and the Lord Plessis Mornay) to ordain some indifferent trial to be made in some one or other of your Majesty's clergy (if not of him who styleth himself your Majesty's *Minister† of simple truth*) of those manifold untruths objected daily against them by learned Catholics, as well of our own as other nations (for the fame of their infamous fidelity hath reached far and near), I am persuaded your most prudent Majesty, as a severe indagator of only truth, would receive far more content and satisfaction to sit as umpire and judge in such a conference of trial than by a hundred such fruitless contentions between your Highness's Protestant and Puritan ministry, as have been often graced with your royal presence. For that this trial would be most easy, brief, and pleasant unto your Majesty and whosoever present; seeing it would be sufficient herein, as the Bishop of Evreux‡ saith, to bring only eyes, to open the books, and see whether the places be truly alleged.

5. And if, peradventure, your Majesty should resolve and first adjudge to make some trial of my religious mean-

* At Fontainebleau, the 4th of May, 1600. † Mr. Thomas Morton.

‡ In his Answer to the Lord Plessis's Challenge.

ing and true fidelity, in imputing this so heinous crime (*prevarication in God's cause*) unto so many and principal men, as in this search are attached, I shall ever be ready (God willing) to render such account thereof unto your Majesty, as if I shall be truly found (and I dare appeal unto the mature judgment of your Royal Majesty alone) maliciously to have wronged any one of them therein, I shall most willingly submit myself unto your Majesty's heaviest censure, yea, if it were to lay down my life prostrate at your Majesty's royal feet, to be rejected and cast forth from the society of men. And hereby, whereas your Majesty's noble ancestors have promerited that thrice worthy title to England's victorious crown, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, so your Highness shall, by consent of tongues and nations, purchase to your immortal fame this singular epithet or encomium, ZEALOUS REVENGER OF TRUTH'S CALUMNIATION.

6. But if, contrariwise, your Majesty's judicious eye shall well discern and see that I have only made sincere relation unto your Highness of what I found to be most true, I would then crave no other award but this, that your prudent wisdom will give strict order and command, that never credit more be given unto these sort of men, or to their writings, especially in matters concerning men's souls; and also that your gracious Majesty will still acknowledge my unworthy self for your Highness's most loyal and devoted subject, though having made this change upon such grounds and reasons as might prevail with one that most carefully tendereth his eternal salvation.

7. Wherefore most humbly, on my knees, I beseech your Royal Majesty to pardon me this my resolution, whereunto I protest, upon my soul and conscience, that no earthly motive drew me, but only my love and obedience

to him that is King of all kings, who saith and threateneth, that whosoever loveth father or mother more than him (wherein no doubt but kings and princes are also included as fathers of their subjects), he is not worthy of him. And, therefore, my trust and supplication is, that for obeying and following this my Heavenly King (in the truth of Catholic religion discovered unto me), I may not incur the displeasure of you, my earthly King, for whose prosperous life and happy reign to eternal felicity I shall be a daily suitor unto his Divine Majesty.

Your Majesty's most humble and devoted subject,

FRANCIS WALSINGHAM.

THE
PREFACE TO THE READER,

CONTAINING THE

Sum of my State before I fell into any doubts about Religion; and how I came into the said doubts.

To the end, gentle reader, that thou mayest better understand the quality of the case that fell out to me these years past with his Excellent Majesty, I have thought expedient to lay down briefly here at the beginning a sincere relation of my state and condition before I fell into any doubt about religion at all. Thus, then, in brief, the matter passed with me. I being brought up from my tender years in London, by the care of the Right Honourable (my very good patron) Sir Francis Walsingham, counsellor and secretary to the late Queen, under the fatherlike tuition and discreet government of Mr. Humphrey Walsingham, my near kinsman and citizen of that city, I was by him placed there for divers years in the common school of Paul's, where I had my first beginnings, and laid some foundation both of learning and Protestant religion, which I continued after, and increased as my years and ability or favour of friends served me, never so much as once doubting of any position held in the said religion by Protestants, but that it was the very truth, indeed, as they professed the same.

2. And when I came to sufficient years and judgment to be able not only to follow sermons but to read books

also of controversies written by Protestant authors, I was not altogether negligent therein, as my often and diligent reading in Mr. Fox's "Acts and Monuments," Mr. Jewell's writing against Mr. Harding, and Mr. Nappier's "Exposition upon the Revelations," with others; and, among strangers, the works of Mr. Calvin and Mr. Beza may bear me witness. By which readings and conferences with others that were of the same religion, I became so earnest and fervent therein, as I resolved not only to continue that profession during life, but further also to make myself one of that clergy. And for the accomplishing thereof, upon the year of Christ 1603, I procured myself to be made deacon by the hands of my Lord of Ely, and, having taken that degree, I thought it incident to the same, not only to confirm myself, but others also, whomsoever I could, in that way.

3. Hereupon I took all occasions to deal with others, either for their confirmation or gaining to Protestant religion. And to this effect was I wont gladly to lend books of that profession to any that would read them, inducing them also earnestly to the same. By which occasion it fell out that one of my acquaintance that seemed to me somewhat backward in this zeal, being offered a Protestant book by me, was content to receive the same with this condition, that I should promise him to read another book that he would lend me in lieu of mine, whereof I accepted, though at that time I neither knew the argument nor the author thereof.

4. This book was entitled, "A Defence of the Censure," given upon two books of William Charke and Meredith Hanmer, ministers, which they wrote against Mr. Edmund Campian, priest of the Society of JESUS, and against his offer of disputation, taken in hand since the death of the said Mr. Campian, &c. Which book I little esteeming at that time, and thinking to have made a good exchange by procuring my said friend to read the Protestant book which I lent him, for that (as I have said) I somewhat suspected his soundness of religion; I carried this other home with me, not meaning that ever it should come so near my heart, as afterward it did, but rather that it

should serve me for some disport, or passing away the time, but especially for gathering out some absurdities against Papists, wherewith I did imagine all their books to be abundantly stuffed. And, therefore, when I came home, I began presently to play with it as with a trifle; but finding wheresoever I lighted certain passages which I could not well digest, and many proofs alleged whereunto I could not answer, I cast it often aside and then took it in hand again. And finally, after many diversities of usage towards it, I resolved to read and pass it over hastily as men take pills, with no good taste at all, but aversion rather of stomach: yet soon after I felt myself so strangely troubled and turmoiled in judgment and conscience upon the reading thereof, as if my soul had taken pills indeed, and could not bear their operation.

5. Wherefore I turned often from this place to that in the book, to find some ease, but everywhere I felt grief and affliction. I thought with myself to contemn it, but this endured not long. Then I imagined to confer the same with others, but I had them not present, nor durst I utter that I had with me any such Papistical book; and seemed to be somewhat ashamed that I should find matter in so small a book which myself could not answer: yet afterward I conferred divers of my difficulties with sundry ministers, without specifying that I had them out of such a book, but they could give me very little satisfaction, or none at all. Whereupon I made divers journeys to London, as well to see books of sundry sorts, as also to confer with some of my friends. And having wearied myself in this sort for the space of divers months, at last I betook myself to a more strange resolution, but yet such as then seemed to me most necessary for appeasing of my mind; and this was, that forsomuch as I had taken two or three several times the oath of supremacy, first to the Queen that was then living, and afterward to his Majesty that now reigneth, protesting and swearing by the same that I held them for supreme heads of the church in all causes as well spiritual as temporal, I did persuade myself that my best comfort of conscience and full satisfaction of my judgment would

The troubles
of mind which
I had by read-
ing the book.

come from my said superior powers, but especially from his learned Majesty, who now governed the crown, as from God's lieutenant and substitute in all causes and affairs whatsoever.

6. Wherefore, after much deliberation, and beating my head this way and that way, not daring to confer with any Papist, or almost to entertain any good thought of them or of their religion, I determined with myself to make a short memorial unto his said Majesty, and to deliver him the sum of my afflictions and doubts, together with the book itself which had been the cause thereof; and to entreat him, by his supreme authority, to give order for my sound satisfaction herein. And so, binding up the old worn-out book which I had in the comeliest manner that I could, I got me to London, and thence to Greenwich; and there, after many difficulties of audience, I exhibited the same, together with my memorial, both tied and conjoined in one, as his Majesty was going unto the chapel, upon Good Friday in the morning, in the year 1604, and thereof had the answer and issue, which afterward I shall set down more at large, with the causes and occasions that were offered unto me to enter further into the search of divers books and controversies of religion than at the beginning I had determined.

7. But here I would advertise thee, gentle reader, of a certain ponderation which I made, after all my searching and inquiring into matters of controversies, which was this: that whensoever in impugning any point of Catholic belief, as namely, *purgatory, prayer for the dead, prayer to saints, real presence*, or the like, the learned Protestants are found to be constrained (through necessity of their cause, for otherwise I suppose they would not) to falsify and corrupt, by cutting off or adding to, or otherwise embezzling some authorities of the ancient fathers or councils, which Catholics do sincerely and truly bring against them for the truth of the said doctrines, it seemed to me that the same doctrines are generally believed and practised by the most ancient Christian church wherein those fathers

*How I resolved
to deliver the
book to his Ma-
jesty.*

*My pondera-
tion, after all
my search
made.*

lived, and consequently I might with far more security believe and follow the same with venerable antiquity, than deny it to be a truth with fallible novelty. And, therefore, I commend unto thy diligent perusal the second and third parts of this Treatise, wherein thou shalt find many principal points now in controversy briefly touched after this manner. So that, in my opinion, the attentive reading of this book alone will give thee sufficient light and ground to resolve thyself, where truth and true dealing doth only remain, whether in the Catholic or Protestant party.

8. But if thou have a desire to satisfy thyself by reading of all that write, especially Protestants (which yet myself sometimes desiring have found to be far more painful than profitable), I would wish thee first to read and consider well those six or seven notes or animadversions in the tenth chapter of the third part of this book; which notes, for that I received them from a very grave and learned man, and by experience found them to be very necessary to be known and observed for the profitable reading of books of controversies, I could not omit to impart the same unto thee, good Christian reader, and my dear countryman, for whose sake, after many difficulties, much travail and pains, I have set forth this no less painful *Search*, and for whose better information and direction to ascend with me unto the mountain of our Lord, the Holy Catholic Church, where only remission of our sins can be obtained, [in this life, and consequently everlasting bliss in the next], I shall ever be willing to undergo far greater.

Observations
about the read-
ing of books of
controversies.

Thy hearty well-willer in Christ Jesus,

FRANCIS WALSHINGHAM.

THE
CONTENTS OF THIS TREATISE.

THE First Part containeth an historical narration of what happened to the author about his first doubts in religion ; how they grew and were increased, especially after his Majesty had remitted him to the Lord of Canterbury, and he with his chaplains and some other learned men had dealt with him.

The Second Part sheweth what resolution he took to read over more diligently Protestant books for clearing a special doubt that he had conceived of their unsincere writing, and what he found therein ; to wit, far more untruths than ever he could have imagined ; which he sheweth by many examples out of sundry writers of his own experience.

The Third Part handleth the like search made into Catholic books, to see whether they do hold the same style and manner of proceeding, which he examineth by looking upon such imputations of falsities as are laid against them by some Protestant authors ; as, namely, by Mr. Matthew Sutcliffe : and what substance he found therein. And, finally, what conclusion he made of all, after some conference had with a certain old man of the Catholic religion.



A

TABLE OF THE CHAPTERS

CONTAINED

IN THIS BOOK.

THE FIRST PART

*Of this Treatise, containing my dealing with the Lord of
Canterbury.*

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

Of the chief doubts and difficulties which offered themselves
unto me in reading over the aforesaid book of the "De-
fence of the Censure," for which I repaired finally to
his Majesty 1

CHAPTER II.

Of my resolution to deliver the book, entitled the "Defence
of the Censure," to the King's Majesty, as I did, with a
memorial, at Greenwich on Good Friday, being the 6th of
April, in the year of our Lord 1604. And how I was
called that same day to the council table before my Lord
of Canterbury and others..... 31

CHAPTER III.

What order my Lord of Canterbury took with me, both by
fair means and foul, for my satisfaction, upon my second
appearance before him at Lambeth, the next day after,
being Easter Eve 43

CHAPTER IV.

Of my third and fourth appearance before my Lord at Lambeth, and how differently he proceeded with me from the first and second time 4

CHAPTER V.

How I, being dismissed by my Lord of Canterbury, with two books of Mr. Bell, I returned into the country; and what cogitations I had by the way, and what happened unto me there with the commissary; and of the reading over of one of Mr. Bell's volumes, entitled, "The Anatomy of Popish Tyranny;" and what I found therein ... 5

CHAPTER VI.

Of my journey to the visitation at Baldock to meet with Mr. Doctor Downham, for conference about my doubts, and what passed therein, and what satisfaction he gave me, both there, and at his house..... 6

CHAPTER VII.

What I did when I came home from the Conference with Mr. Dr. Downham; and how first I took in hand to confer Mr. Charke's Reply with the "Defence of the Censure;" and what I found therein 7

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the perusal of Mr. Bell's second book, entitled the "Survey of Popery;" and what satisfaction it gave me 8

CHAPTER IX.

How I fell upon a third book of Mr. Bell's writing, entitled "The Downfal of Popery;" which I perused also, but found as little satisfaction as in any other thing I had read before, in regard of the unsincere dealing discovered therein 9

CHAPTER X.

Of my repair to London and Lambeth for exhibiting my fifth appearance before my Lord of Canterbury, and of Mr. Dr. Covell's book in defence of Mr. Hooker, &c., and what

	PAGE
He writeth of Mr. Calvin ; and some other points concern- ing my purpose	102

CHAPTER XI.

How, my Lord returning from Westminster, I made my appearance, and what passed in the same. How I was finally referred to Mr. Doctor Barlow, Dean of Chester, and so dismissed again unto the end of the next term ; and what conference I had with the said Doctor Barlow... 112

 THE SECOND PART

Of this Treatise, concerning my Search into Protestant Writers and Writings.

CHAPTER I.

What resolution I took after I was thus dismissed by my Lord of Canterbury ; how I came to confer with a learned man of the Catholic side in prison ; and of a new obligation that I took upon me to read and examine further, both Protestant and Catholic authors, for trial of two points that pressed me much 120

CHAPTER II.

How by occasion of seeking out the foresaid books, I happened also upon others that gave me much light in divers matters, though with more trouble of mind than before ; but especially about Martin Luther's conference with the Devil 127

CHAPTER III.

How, after the perusal of these conferences of Mr. Luther and Mr. Zuinglius with the Devil, I passed further to examine some of their doctrines before mentioned ; and what I found confirmed thereof by themselves ; as, also, the great dissensions I discovered in Protestant writers of different professions 136

CHAPTER IV.

PA 4

What I found in the same Protestant authors concerning Mr. Calvin and Mr. Beza, and their manner of proceeding. And what I observed of myself in perusing Mr. Calvin's works concerning the point in hand of untrue dealing, false accusations, &c. 14

CHAPTER V.

What view I made of English Protestant authors, especially of Mr. Jewell, for trial of this point of true, or untrue, dealing in their writings. With a note prefixed of the chief books which I found written on both sides, from the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign; and what matter they administered unto me of consideration 16

CHAPTER VI.

Of other places observed by mine own reading out of Mr. Jewell's works, of like unsincerity to the former, which greatly moved me to suspect his fidelity in writing..... 17

CHAPTER VII.

What strange shifts, sleights, frauds, deceits, and other such cunning and artificial conveyances, the Catholic writers do object, besides the former particular untruths, out of Mr. Jewell's books; and what I found thereof to be true or false 20

CHAPTER VIII.

How besides these escapes of Mr. Jewell, observed and objected by others, I had noted also divers myself, by reading his works, which I could not well answer or excuse: as neither some other alleged by Mr. Rastall, who objecteth thirteen several chapters of divers sorts of falsities 21

CHAPTER IX.

The justification which Mr. Jewell endeavoureth to make of divers of the foresaid falsities, deceits, and corruptions objected against him; and how I examined the same for my better satisfaction, but could little or nothing be satis- 22

	PAGE
fied therein ; and consequently I remained more doubtful and perplexed than before	227

CHAPTER X.

H ow after this I proceeded to examine the imputations of other untruths laid against sundry Protestant writers, to the number of some nine or ten ; and what I found in the perusal thereof, especially in imputations laid against Mr. Willet	242
--	-----

CHAPTER XI.

H ow next after this I lighted upon a book of Mr. Doctor Dove, wherein he persuadeth English Recusants to leave their recusancy, and to join with him and the English Church in points of Protestant religion ; the reasons which he useth, and the small substance and bad manner of dealing that I found therein	259
--	-----

CHAPTER XII.

What I found in Mr. Thomas Rogers's book of the " Ca- tholic Doctrine of the Church of England," contained in thirty-nine articles agreed upon by the English clergy ...	275
--	-----

 THE THIRD PART

*Of this Treatise, containing my Search into Catholic Writers and
Writings, with my final Resolution.*

CHAPTER I.

H ow, after this trial of Protestant books, I resorted unto the writings of the other side, to see whether the like sleights were used also by them, and what I found therein. And first, what Mr. Jewell objecteth for falsities against Dr. Harding, and how they are answered	290
---	-----

CHAPTER II.

What imputation of lies and untruths hath been made by others against writers of the Roman religion ; and princi-	
--	--

	PAGE
pally by Mr. Dr. Sutcliffe, in sundry books of his written these years past; and first against Cardinal Bellarmine. And of what force they are proved to be	307

CHAPTER III.

Other imputations of like lies, forgeries, and falsifications objected against Cardinal Baronius by the same author, Mr. Matthew Sutcliffe; and what truth or falsehood I found therein	329
---	-----

CHAPTER IV.

The examination which I made of the falsifications, lies, and forgeries objected by the same Mr. Sutcliffe against Father Persons in particular; and how I was more diligent and attent in this point than in any of the former, and why. And what finally I found therein.....	340
---	-----

CHAPTER V.

Of other eight of Mr. Sutcliffe's charges against Father Persons, as they lie together in the end of his battery ...	358
--	-----

CHAPTER VI.

The examination of other untruths objected against Father Persons, by Mr. Sutcliffe, in his book, entitled, "A Full and Round Answer to the Warn-word," containing, as Mr. Sutcliffe's words are, "A list of lies, falsities, fooleries, impieties, and other enormous faults and abuses"	380
---	-----

CHAPTER VII.

Of other objections of lies, falsities, corruptions, and other such abuses, gathered by Mr. Sutcliffe against Father Persons in his answer to the book of the "Three Conversions," which he entitled "A Subversion of Robert Persons," &c.	408
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

The same subject is continued of objecting lies and falsifications by Mr. Sutcliffe against Father Persons's book of "Three Conversions;" which objections are found to have more malice and wilful falsity than the former	432
---	-----

CHAPTER IX.

PAGE

What cogitations I had upon the sight and ponderation of all these falsities found in Mr. Sutcliffe's objections against Father Persons and others; and among other points, I thought whether it were possible for him to answer to these; and how, for trial hereof, I resolved upon two different means here set down 458

CHAPTER X.

Of the journey which I was forced to make; and, first, how by that means I came acquainted with a certain old man, that gave me much light in many things, with certain notes of his for the profitable reading books of controversies; and of the conferences that I had with him about my doubts and difficulties 485

CHAPTER XI.

Of the second conference that I had with the old man; and what passed therein, especially about that which I read in St. Augustine by his appointment; and what further counsel he gave me, and answered certain doubts by me proposed 503

CHAPTER XII.

Of my third conference with the old man, and what counsel and directions he gave me for my reconciliation to Almighty God, and conforming my life to the true prescript of Catholic religion; with the conclusion of the whole work 518

A SEARCH
INTO
MATTERS OF RELIGION.

THE FIRST PART OF THIS TREATISE, CONTAINING MY
DEALING WITH MY LORD OF CANTERBURY.

CHAPTER I.

Of the Chief Doubts and Difficulties which offered themselves unto me in reading over the aforesaid Book of the Defence of the Censure, for which I repaired finally unto his Majesty.

HAVING set down before in part the great variety of affections and troubles of mind which I felt in reading this book, which cannot so effectually be expressed by pen, as then I felt them, in every passage almost that I read, and was not well able to answer; I could wish that the learned reader would examine rather the matter by reading over the Treatise itself, than to stand to my relation thereof: but yet some few principal heads wherein I did stick most at that time, and was most desirous to be satisfied in, were these that ensue.

MY FIRST DIFFICULTY.

Why Protestants refuse Disputation and other public trials.

1. My first difficulty arose and began to grow even with the very first lines of the book, to wit, of a complaint set down in the Author's Epistle prefixed to Mr. Charke, and continued and repeated again afterwards oftentimes throughout the whole work, where the said author doth complain greatly that the Catholics having made many offers of some just trial of their and the Protestant religion in England, either by public disputation, preaching, free writing, or printing, they could never yet be admitted unto any; which made me much to marvel, first, whether it were true or no; and secondly, if it were true, upon what cause or ground this should be so long denied. For that supposing our Protestant religion to be true, and most certainly founded on the word of God, as I was persuaded, I could not see why this public trial might not, and ought not to be granted.

2. Now then, that the Papists had indeed offered themselves to these trials, it appeared unto me very probable, both for that Mr. Campian his first writing (against which Mr. Charke and Mr. Hanmer did begin their contention) was to this effect, to offer equal disputation, or any of the other trials now mentioned: and by this book it appeared that the Censure upon those writings did offer the same while Mr. Campian was yet at liberty, and not taken in England: and this defence of the said Censure after his death doth most earnestly continue and iterate the same suit for indifferent trial, in the name of all Catholics, propounding therewith sundry most equal conditions thereof, as to the reader may appear; and charging Mr. Charke and the ministers that they dare not come to this trial for fear of the weakness of their cause.

3. Then moreover I considered, that Mr. Campian, Mr. Shirwine, and others of the learned sort of Papists that made these offers, had not in effect been disputed withal, but only in the Tower privately, and that (as their friends gave out) upon unequal conditions, when they were either

condemned or like to be condemned to death, as after they were, and executed also. And that one Mr. John Hart, another young man of that religion, Mr. John Hart offered disputation. though graduate (as I have heard) in Divinity by the University of Douay, coming over about the same time, and either offering himself, or being taken and brought before my said honourable patron Sir Francis Walsingham, and demanding this liberty of public trial, was not admitted thereunto, but rather, after some months' liberty, was sent to the Tower, and there, after his condemnation to death, he was assigned to confer with Mr. Doctor John Reynolds in the said Tower, and that conference afterwards published, but with partiality (as the Papists said): and the like they affirmed of the said disputation held in the Tower by Mr. Campian and his fellows: all which complaints and suspicions seemed to me might well have been avoided, if the said trials had been public and free, as the Papists demanded them.

4. Moreover, I saw and considered, that whereas his Majesty, soon after his coming into England, was resolved graciously to hear the differences in religion that were between his own subjects, and to that effect yielded for three or four days most honourable audience in his own person, to hear and judge the contentions between the Protestants and Puritans; yet, notwithstanding, the Papists in this conference had no place at all, nor were so much as permitted to propose their difficulties, or produce their proofs of their religion, which was marked by many, and divers also spake thereof. Wherefore upon all these considerations I was much troubled, doubting lest this straitness used in not admitting Papists to any kind of this equal offered trial might have some mystery in it; and that all things went not so clear indeed on our side as I had hitherto believed. Therefore I desired greatly to have the opinion and counsel of our learned men, for clearing this doubt. And this was the substance of my first difficulty.

MY SECOND DIFFICULTY.

Particular Ways of trying Spirits ; which is Catholic, and which Heretical.

6. After this, as I passed on from the Epistle to the answer of Mr. Charke's Preface, about trial of spirits, there arose another great doubt, for that the author of the Defence, passing from the general offer of trial unto divers particular ways and manners thereof, taketh Mr. Charke at his word, who had alleged of St. John, that we must not believe all spirits, *but try them whether they be of God or no.** Upon which principle the author of the Defence, joining roundly with Mr. Charke, offereth to stand to all lawful trial whatsoever, and thereupon taketh in hand to prove that Protestants indeed have no sure ground or way to try an heretical or Catholic spirit ; and that Catholics have many, whereof he setteth down nine in that place ; shewing, first, that the only way offered by Protestants, of only Scripture, is no way at all, and that for divers reasons which there he setteth down ; and one among the rest, that all heretics, old and new, have professed this way, all the sectaries also of our time, not only against Catholics, but also against Lutherans, Zuin-glians, Calvinists, and the rest ; and consequently that this way alone, without other helps, is not the way to end controversies with heretics, or to try spirits.

7. Wherefore on the other side he sheweth, that Catholics have not only this way to try spirits by only Scripture, but have many other helps also to fortify the same, which, being joined together, do make a very strong probation or examen of a Catholic or heretical spirit.† And for this first proof of express words of Scripture, for matters in controversy between us, he setteth down a great number of their positions that have express words of Scripture for them, and we no express Scripture against them ; so as they cannot be avoided by us, but by

* 1 John 4. Answer to Charke's Preface, pp. 13, 14.

† See Defence, p. 28.

a different interpretation. As, for example, he saith, they have for the supremacy of St. Peter these express words (Matt. xvi.) unto Peter, "Thou art a rock, and upon this rock will I build my church:" but that we have not the contrary in plain Scripture. And the like he urgeth in many other controversies, whose words together with so many examples, for that they moved me much, I shall set them down as they lie in the said book.

8. "Now," saith he, "for our parts, we offer unto them all the best, surest, and easiest means that possibly can be devised, or that ever were used in God's church for trial of truth or discovering of heresy." For, as for the books of Scripture, seeing we must receive them upon the credit and authority of the ancient church, we are content to accept for canonical, and allow those, and none other, which antiquity in Christendom hath agreed upon. Next, for the contents of Scripture; if our adversaries will stand upon express and plain words hereof, we are content to agree thereunto, and we must needs be far superiors therein. For what one express plain text have they in any one point or article against us, which we do not acknowledge literally as they do, and as the words do lie? But we have against them infinite, which they cannot admit without glosses and fond interpretations of their own. For example's sake, we have it expressly said to Peter (that signifieth a rock), *Upon this rock will I build my church*, Matt. xvi. They have nowhere the contrary in plain Scripture. We have expressly (touching the apostles' inequality), *He that is great among you, let him be made as the younger*, Luke xxii. They have nowhere, There is none greater than other among you. We have expressly, *This is my body*, Matt. xxvi. You have nowhere, This is the sign of my body. We have expressly, *The bread that I will give you is my flesh*, John vi. They have nowhere, It is but the sign of my flesh. We have expressly, *A man is justified by works, and not by faith only*,

The variety of trial that Catholics do offer.

Books of Scripture.

Express words.

Supremacy.

Real presence.

Justification.

James ii. They have nowhere, A man is justified by faith alone; no, nor that he is justified by faith without works, talking of works that follow faith, whereof only our controversy is. We have expressly, *Whose*

Absolution.

sins you forgive, are forgiven; whose sins you retain, they are retained, John xx. They have nowhere, that priests cannot forgive or retain sins in earth. We have expressly, *The doers of the law shall be justified,* Rom. ii. They have nowhere, that the law required at Christians' hands is impossible, or that the doing thereof

Vows.

justifieth not Christians. We have expressly, *Vow ye, and render your vows,* Ps. lxxv. They have nowhere, Vow ye not; or if ye have vowed, break

Traditions.

your vows. We have expressly, *Keep the traditions which you have learned either by word or epistle,* 1 Thess. ii. They have nowhere, The Apostles left no traditions to the church unwritten.

Commandments.

9. We have expressly, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments;* and (when he said he did that already) *If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, and follow me.* They have nowhere, that either the commandments cannot be kept, or we are not bound unto them, or that there is no degree of life one perfecter than another. We have expressly,

Works.

Work your own salvation with fear and trembling, Phil. ii. They have nowhere, either that a man can work nothing towards his own salvation, being holpen with the grace of God; or that a man should make it of his belief, that he shall be saved without all doubt or fear. We have expressly, *Do ye the*

Penance.

worthy fruits of penance, Luke iii. They have nowhere, that faith only is sufficient, without all satisfaction, and all other works of penance on our parts. We have expressly, *That every man shall be saved according to his works,* Apoc. xx. They have nowhere, that men shall be judged only according to their faith. We have expressly, *That there remaineth a retribution, stipend, and pay to every good work in heaven,* Mark ix., 1 Cor. iii., Apoc. xxii., Ps. cxviii. They have nowhere, that good works done in Christ do merit nothing. We have ex-

pressly, *That it is a holy cogitation to pray for the dead*, 2 Macc. xii. They have nowhere, it is superstition or unlawful to do the same. We have an express example of a holy man, that offered sacrifice for the dead, 2 Macc. xii. They have no example of any good man that ever reprehended it. We have expressly, that the affliction which Daniel used upon his body, *was acceptable in the sight of God*, Dan. x. They have nowhere, that such voluntary corporal afflictions are in vain. We have expressly, that an angel did present Tobias's good works and almsdeeds before God, Tob. xii. They have nowhere, that angels cannot, or do not the same. We read expressly, that Jeremiah the prophet, after he was dead, *prayed for the people of Israel*. 2 Macc. xv. They have nowhere the contrary to this in express Scripture. I leave many things more that I might repeat, but this is enough for example's sake to prove, that albeit our adversaries do vaunt of Scripture, yet, when it cometh to express words, they have no text against us, in lieu of so many as I have here repeated against them; nor can they shew that we are driven to deny any one book of the Bible, nor to glose upon the plain words of any one plain place of Scripture, as they are enforced to do. And this, saith he, of the first way by only Scriptures.

Prayer for the dead.

Sacrifice for the dead.

Voluntary corporal afflictions.

We have

Alms.

Prayer of Saints.

10. But now to this, he adjoineth the other aforesaid helps for discerning between a Catholic and heretical spirit in the ways and manners of their proofs; as, namely, what was the sense and judgment of the ancient fathers, doctors, and councils, from time to time, upon those places, who condemned all sorts of heretics, as they rose up in their days; the universality, antiquity, and consent of the universal Christian church, descending from time to time by succession of bishops, especially those of the Roman Church; by which St. Irenæus, St. Epiphanius, St. Augustine, Optatus, and others, did convince heretics to be heretics in their days. He addeth also one rule, with a certain challenge annexed, that greatly troubled me, that is,

Other ways of trying spirits besides express Scripture.

that whereas there hath been so many hundred heresies for the space of a thousand and six hundred years in the Christian church condemned and anathematized by her and her bishops, if it could be shewn that the Papists do agree or participate with any one point truly and sincerely, with two conditions, that is to say, that the thing was judged for an heresy in old time, and that the Papists do now hold it in that sense and meaning wherein it was condemned, that then he will yield that their religion is false, and their church no true church.

11. But, on the other side, he offered to shew invincibly that the Protestants do hold divers old and evident heresies with the said two conditions, to wit, such as were condemned openly for heresies by the ancient Catholic Church, and in the selfsame sense and meaning wherein they were condemned, as is evident (saith he) in the heresies of Aerius against *Fasting days* commanded by the church, and *prayer for the dead*: as also of the heretic Vigilantius, that denied *saints to be prayed unto* and their relics to be honoured:* of the heretic Jovinian, that compared *matrimony with virginity*, and other like, for which he allegeth the testimonies of St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine: and the matter is so clear, that Dr. Fulke's words are brought in against Bristowe's Motives, saying, that Epiphanius and Augustine were deceived in recording those for heresies which are not; and that Jerome rather raileth than reasoneth; and that Vigilantius was a good man, and his opinion sound.†

12. So then, this matter troubled me greatly; for I considered with myself, that he that holdeth any one heresy cannot be saved, which is not only conform to Scripture, that an heretical man is most certainly damned, but also confessed by both parts, that only a true Catholic man can be saved, and that he which holdeth any one heresy cannot be truly Catholic, for that the names and natures of the things are repugnant; and, consequently,

* Epiph. hæres. 75. Hier. cont. Vigilant. et cont. Jovinian. Aug. lib. de hæresibus; hæres. 50. Defence, p. 15.

† Dr. Fulke against Bristowe's Motives, p. 54, tit. 3.

that if our Protestants' Church did hold any one confessed heresy, as here seemeth to be proved by three ancient doctors, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, then cannot our church, thought I, be the true Catholic Church; and, therefore, I desired greatly to be resolved of this doubt, for that it much troubled my conscience.

MY THIRD DIFFICULTY.

About the first Beginners of the Protestant Religion in this age.

13. Having passed over the Epistle and Preface, wherein the former two difficulties are contained, and entering into the bulk of the book, I met with divers other difficulties of no less importance, to my seeming, than the former; but especially, to omit the rest, about the first beginners and setters forth of our Protestant doctrine in this last age, to wit, Martin Luther, with his scholars, Zuinglius, Carolostadius, and Ecolampadius in Wittenberg, that afterwards contradicted him in many things, as also John Calvin, Theodore Beza, Farellus, and some others that followed Calvin in a different way from the former, in Geneva. For that albeit I easily considered that men are always men, and have their imperfections, and that religion is not to be measured by the life of the teacher; yet, notwithstanding, I considered also, that whensoever God did send any men extraordinarily to reform the abuses or imperfections of others in his church, they were always commonly of more eminent virtue in their lives than others, as is seen by all the patriarchs and prophets, by St. John Baptist, and others, that in succeeding ages were sent by God to introduce more strict manner of life.

That reformers sent by God are commonly of more excellent life.

14. But now for these men before named, Luther and the rest, this writer of the Defence doth shew, by very great testimonies, that they were men far inferior for virtuous life unto the common sort of honest men; nay, indeed,

Of the beginning and progress of Martin Luther.

very wicked, if his authors speak truly; and consequently it seemed to me very hard, that God should choose such men, and give them his Holy Spirit (without which no true reformation could be made), to be the beginners of so notable a reformation in the church, as we presume ours to be, by Luther and the rest.

15. And to speak first of Luther, his vocation and spirit, this book out of divers writers recounteth strange matters of his beginning, but I was little moved with any but with such as either were recounted by himself, in his own works, or testified by Protestant writers themselves there cited, as Sleidan; Lavaterus, Gesnerus, and others.* As, namely—how his first departing from the Roman Church and doctrine was upon contention with friars of another order; and then, that one of his first and greatest motives, or rather the principal of all, to write against the Mass, was a conference he had with the devil himself, which he describeth in his own book “*De Missa Privata*,” in these words:—*contigit me semel sub mediam noctem subitò expergefieri, &c.* It happened, saith he, that once I suddenly awoke about midnight, and then Satan began this disputation with me:—*Hearken, thou learned Dr. Luther, &c., and then the devil layeth down five long arguments against the mass*, adding in the end, *Age, prome ubi scriptum est, ubi jussit aut præcepit hoc Deus?*† “Go to now, shew me where the mass is found in the written word, where hath God commanded it?”

16. This manner of arguing in the devil did much trouble me; for it seemed to be a form prescribed by the devil, which myself had often used, and had seen our own learned men to stand much upon, to ask where every thing is written: besides that it seemeth that either the devil deceived Luther in this place, or else that the said devil was very careful to have God’s commandment kept, when he asked where God hath commanded the mass to be said; and for that, in my sense and opinion, the contrary to that which the devil saith and intendeth to persuade, is always to be held for true, I was much amazed in this point; especially for so much as Luther in this place

* Defence of the Censure, p. 68.

† See Part II. c. ii.

(which afterwards I came to see and read by help of Mr. Dr. Covell, in my Lord of Canterbury's house) doth set down at large his own answers to the devil's arguments, the devil's replies to his answers, unto which replies Luther confessing that he was not able to satisfy, did finally yield, upon those reasons of the devil, to banish the mass and sacrifice, which seemed unto me a marvellous dangerous ground. And albeit sometimes I did comfort myself with the evasion of Mr. Charke, that it might be only some spiritual conference or temptation of Satan; yet the proofs of the book to the contrary, out of all circumstances, seem so plain as no way I could quiet myself therein. And this was another great trouble, whereof I greatly desired to be delivered.

MY FOURTH DIFFICULTY.

About Luther, his Spirit, and whether he were a good man.

17. Next to this, I was greatly troubled about Luther, his spirit and doctrine. For as this book went about to shew that he began his work of opposition to the Romish Church by the conference and direction of Satan, so he endeavoured also to prove that he took of Satan's spirit, and followed the same afterward in most of his actions and writings. As, for example, he sheweth him not only not to have had any spirit of humility or modesty in any part almost of his writings, but rather the most outrageous fury of railing that ever lightly was seen to be put down by pen. And surely I am ashamed to repeat here any part of that which this book citeth out of his own works and words against the noble and learned King Henry the Eighth, amongst other of his adversaries, it is so shameful, or rather shameless; but yet that you may see how much cause I had to be troubled with the matter, I shall here lay down some lines as they lie in the book.* *I talk (saith he to King Henry) with a lying scoundrel, covered with the titles of a king, a Thomistical brain,† a clownish wit, a doltish head, a bug, and hypocrite of the Thomists,‡ most wicked, foolish, and impudent Harry.*

* Defence, p. 16.

† Fol. 337.

‡ Fol. 338.

This glorious king lieth stoutly like a king. And here now must I deal not with ignorance and blockishness only, but with obstinate and impudent wickedness of this Harry; for he doth not only lie like a most vain scurre, but passeth a most wicked knave, in detorting of Scripture. See whether there be any spark in him of an honest man. Surely he is a chosen vessel of the devil. I would to God pigs could speak, to judge between this Harry and me. But I will take asses that can speak. Judge you (ye sophists of the universities of Paris, Louvain, and Cologne) what this Harry's logic is worth. I am ashamed (Harry) of thy impudent forehead, which art no more a king now, but a sacrilegious thief against Christ's own words. I will feign here certain kinds of fools and madmen, to the end that I may set out my king in his colours, and shew that my bedlam king doth pass all bedlamness itself. What need had I of such pigs to dispute withal? Thou liest in thy throat, foolish and sacrilegious king. This block my L. M. Harry hath taught together with his asses and pigs, and now he is mad, and crieth and foameth at the mouth. Neither could I with all my strength make this miserable king so filthy and abominable a spectacle to the world as he by fury maketh himself. What harlot ever durst brag of her shame, as this most impudent mouth of his doth? This fool must have a dictionary to learn what a sacrifice is. Oh, unhappy that I am, to be enforced to lose time with such monsters of folly, and cannot get a learned man to contend with me! So he. And I leave infinite despicable, slanderous, and scurril words which this impudent apostate useth against his majesty. And some are so dishonest as I am ashamed to English them, as where he saith: *Jus mihi erit Majestatem Anglicam stercore conspergere.*† And again: *Sit ergo mea hæc generalis responsio ad omnes sentinas insulsissimæ hujus Larvæ.*‡ Again: *Hæc sunt robora nostra, adversus quæ obmutescere coguntur Henrici, Thomistæ Papistæ, et quicquid est facis, sentinæ, latrinæ impiorum et sacrilegorum ejusmodi: sordes**

Now intolerable is this in a renegade friar.

See the pride of an apostate against three famous universities.

* Fol. 339.

† Fol. 333.

‡ Fol. 337.

istæ et labes hominum Thomistæ et Henrici: sacrilegus Henricorum et asinorum cultus: furor insulssimorum asinorum, et Thomisticorum porcorum: os Vestræ Dominationis impurum et sacrilegum. And a hundred more sentences like.

Luther's spirit in railing speech.

18. Thus far I have thought good to cite out of the book itself, and hereupon every man may think what afflicted cogitations I had: for that ever I had held this man for a great saint, and for such an one had I read him set down by Mr. Fox, in his "Acts and Monuments," and registered for a confessor among the saints of our Protestant Church upon the 17th of February, whereof Mr. Fox also holdeth King Henry to have been one, and consequently that this railing of M. Luther was against one of his own church: in this then did I wonderfully desire to be resolved and satisfied.

MY FIFTH DIFFICULTY.

Whether Luther's Doctrine were of God or no.

19. Another point of great difficulty was unto me about certain heads of doctrine which the said book laid down, as taken out of Luther's own words and sense, in divers parts of his acknowledged works; all seeming to tend, for the most part, to extraordinary liberty of life, and to the enervation of all Christian discipline, and consequently could not seem to come from the spirit of Christ. I shall here set down ten of them as they were first objected (at least nine of them) against Mr. Charke by the Censure, and now all of them defended by this book, and proved to be truly objected, and the doctrine thereof to be wicked and scandalous. Thus then they lie:—

20. I. *That there is no sin but incredulity; neither can a man damn himself, do what mischief he can, except he will refuse to believe.**—In his book *de Cap. Babyl. cap. de Bapt.*

II. *The Ten Commandments appertain nothing to us.*—Serm. de Moy.

* Defence, p. 45.

III. *It is a false opinion, and to be abolished, that there are four Gospels.*—In præfat. ad Novum Testamentum. *And that he saith this because the other three Gospels talk too much of good works.*

IV. *If any woman cannot or will not prove by order of law the insufficiency of her husband, let her request at his hand a divorce, or else by his consent lie privily with his brother, or with some other man.*—Lib. de Matrim. in Epith. super 1 Cor. vii.

V. *If the wife will not come, let the maid come.*—Serm. de Matrimonio.

VI. *Matrimony is much more excellent than virginity.*—Lib. de Votis Evangelicis.

VII. *Christ and St. Paul did not counsel, but dissuade virginity unto Christians.*—Lib. de Votis Monasticis.

VIII. *It is as necessary for every man to have a wife, as it is to eat, drink, or sleep.*—Lib. de Votis Conjug. et in Assert. art. 16.

IX. *All Christians are as holy and as just as the mother of God and as the apostles were.*—Serm. de Tri. de B. Mariâ, et Com. Ep. 1 Petri.*

X. *We do assuredly hold for heretics and aliens from the church of God all sacramentaries that deny Christ's body to be received really with our fleshly mouth in the sacrament.*—Art. 28, contra Lovanienses, tom. ii. Wittemb.

21. All which doctrines when the author of this book hath proved at large, one by one, to be the true doctrines of Luther, and verifiable out of his own books, then he maketh this conclusion or consideration thereon.† *That if a Christian man cannot damn himself by any sins except he will refuse to believe; if to keep virginity, and resist the pleasures of the flesh, be neither much commendable (for that marriage is far better), nor profitable, nor possible, for so much as a wife is as necessary as meat, drink, or sleep; and further yet, if when a man hath taken one wife, he may upon causes lie with her sister, or with the next of her kin; and if these will be obstinate, he may take*

* Defence, p. 74.

† Ibid. p. 65.

*the maid instead of the mistress, and withal this may be, notwithstanding, as holy and just as ever was Peter or Paul, or the mother of Christ: if all this be true (saith this book, as both Martin Luther warranteth and Mr. Charke defendeth), who can complain (saith he) of the hard way to heaven? Who can say, the gate is strait, as Christ our Saviour did?**

Corollaries
upon Mr. Lu-
ther's doc-
trine.

22. Thus wrote he. And I could not tell what to answer, for they seemed strange doctrines to me to come from such a man, whom I held in so great veneration; but especially, and above all, the last point troubled me to consider, that he denounced us all for heretics and aliens from the church of God, that held the opinion of Calvin and Zuinglius, in denying the *real presence* in the sacrament, which made me think that Luther favoured more the Papists than the Church of England in this behalf. And then you may imagine how this matter held me suspense and perplex until I were satisfied.

MY SIXTH DIFFICULTY.

About the first Framers of our Protestant Doctrine in England.

23. If the consideration of these things in Dr. Luther, that was the first enlightened with the new beams of our Protestant religion in general, did so much trouble me, you must not marvel if I were more troubled by descending down to further particulars of those that followed Luther, especially in the framing of our doctrine in England, which I had hitherto held for true, and which men I had principally relied upon, whom this book setteth forth to have been chiefly five; to wit, Carolostadius, Oecolampadius, and Zuinglius, that were the first three scholars of Luther, who began (as is known) in the year 1517; and upon the year 1524, not full seven years after Luther's beginning, they are said to have broken from him again, in the matter of the sacrament and divers other points, whereby they made a new distinct sect, and therefore were

* Matt. vii. ; Luke xiii.

called by him first of all Sacramentaries, and were solemnly accursed by him, and denounced for heretics, both they and all their followers, as before you have heard.* And the first of them was banished, by Luther's procurement, out of Wittemberg, and all the state of the

Carlostadius. Duke of Saxony, and so ended his life in banishment and miserable estate, being forced to labour the ground and live thereby, having been first Archdeacon of Wittemberg, as Sleidan, himself a Pro-

Oecolampadius. testant historiographer, doth testify.† The second was so lewd, as Luther himself affirmeth him to have been slain by the devil, in his book "*De*

Missa Privata." The third, to wit, Zuinglius,

Zuinglius. the most famous of all the three, that most published this sacramentary doctrine,‡ is alleged to confess of himself, that he began that doctrine upon conference also with a certain spirit in the night, *which*, he saith, *he knew not whether it were black or white*,§ to wit, good or bad; and, finally, was slain in the field, in a commotion against his country, stirred up principally by himself, in the year of our Lord 1531, Oct. 9.

24. But now of the other two, John Calvin and Theodore Beza, who, leaving Luther, and taking the sacramentary doctrine from Zuinglius and the rest, brought it to the form which now we hold in England, the Defence setteth down far more enormous things, of strange and extraordinary wickedness, committed by them,|| all which he reciteth out of a book of their lives, published upon the year 1577, by one Jerome Hermes Bolsack, doctor of physic, who had practised that science many years in Geneva, and other places round about, in Calvin's time, when himself was a Protestant, and afterwards for many years lived in Lyons, in France, dedicating this his book to M. Epinac, archbishop of the said city, with this protestation: *I am here for love of the truth*, said he, *to refute Theodore Beza's false and shameless lies in the praise of Calvin, his master, protesting before God, and all the holy*

* In the fifth difficulty, and Defence, p. 74.

† Sleidan, lib. v. Historiæ.

‡ Defence, p. 91.

§ Zuing. lib. de Subsid. Euchar. Def. p. 91.

|| Ib. p. 77, &c.

court of heaven, before all the world, and the Holy Ghost itself, that neither anger, nor envy, nor evil will, hath made me speak or write any one thing against the truth of my conscience.

25. And having made this protestation, he setteth down every thing, with the time, place, year, and other circumstance, so particularly, as it seemeth impossible that it should be feigned: as that John Calvin was branded publicly on the shoulder with a burning-iron for *sedomy*, by order of the Bishop of Noyon, in France, who preserved him thereby from public death; and that this was testified by public record of the city of Noyon; and that this was registered by M. Bertilier, secretary of the Council of Geneva, under a public and sworn notary: and from thence how he ran into Italy, and travelled up and down, by Basle, Strasburg, Lausanne, and other places, and afterwards coming to Geneva, and joining with Farel and Coverald, and some other ministers there of the Zuinglian doctrine, moved great tumults; whereupon he had sentence of banishment pronounced against him, on the 10th of April, A. D. 1527, and so he changed his apparel and fled; but after some years, by faction, got to return again, and his adversaries banished; as Perinus, the governor of the city; Castalio Caroli, Bernardine Ochin, and Peter Morand, ministers;* of which revenging nature of his, even against many of the Protestant religion, many examples are set down; as also of his excessive ambition, intolerable hypocrisy, delicate niceness, and lascivious carnality: the particulars whereof I mean not here to touch, but remit the reader to the book itself.

26. But now for Beza, who lived when the book was written, he reporteth many more enormous things;† as that he kept both a boy and a quean, the one called Andibertus, the other Candida, and made most filthy verses in commendation, as it were, and in comparison of these two carnal lusts; that he ran away with a tailor's wife, that dwelt in Calendars Street, of Paris, unto Geneva, she robbing her husband to accompany him; and that he continued the like

Other points
touching Theo-
dore Beza.

* Defence, pp. 81, 82, &c.

† Ibid. pp. 86, 87, &c.

life after, keeping a harlot named Claudia, together with his own wife, and killing his own child begotten upon her, to cover the sin, by letting her blood above measure; and many other foul things, which I avoid to name for loathsomeness; but they may be read in great part in this book, whereunto, for brevity's sake, I remit the reader, to peruse the said ungrateful argument from page 77; at the reading whereof, truly, not only my heart did rue, but the hairs also of my head did almost stand on end to hear the same, and much more to consider thereof seriously, as often I did.

27. And I was the more moved with this cogitation, for that I had seen and read a certain book,* set forth, as was said, by my Lord of London that then was, and now of Canterbury, against the Puritans; and another by Dr. Sutcliffe, wherein the lives, counsels, and actions of Messrs. Calvin and Beza are so disgracefully set forth, out of their own epistles and other testimonies, as it may seem thereby that they were scarce common honest men, and much less such holy servants of God as I had before apprehended them to be; which made me reflect back, not only upon all the particulars that Dr. Bolsack had set down under the former protestation, but upon Luther himself also, and upon that which he had left written of others, his first scholars; of all which I desired some substantial satisfaction, and remained in extreme torment of mind, until I might have it, casting about twenty ways by what means I might seek it. And yet this was not all.

MY SEVENTH DIFFICULTY.

Whether Lutherans, Zuinglians, &c. may be truly admitted as brethren of our English Church and faith.

28. There followed out of the former considerations another difficulty, of no less scruple and trouble to my mind than the rest, which was, that this book, shewing the union in points of faith to be such among Papists as

* The Book of Dangerous Positions, with the Survey of Disciplinary Doctrine.

they admitted none for their brethren, or into their church, which in any one substantial point did differ from them (which seemed to me most conform to reason and religion, and to the speeches of ancient fathers which I had read in that behalf:) our Church of England is proved by this book (*the Defence of the Censure*) to receive and admit for brethren such as could never agree, nor cannot at this day, in sundry substantial points of doctrine, as this author doth prove, not only by their particular books, confessions, protestations, and writings one against the other; but also by sundry synods and Protestant councils, wherein the one hath condemned the other.* And, namely, he citeth this saying of Dr. Luther among many others: *I do protest, saith he, before God and the world, that I do not agree with them (the Sacramentaries), nor ever will, while the world standeth, but will have my hands clear from the blood of those sheep, which these heretics do drive from Christ, deceive, and kill.* And again, in the same place: *Cursed be the concord and charity of Sacramentaries, for ever and ever, and to all eternity:*† and a great deal more, which in the said book may be seen.

29. Now, then, with this I conceived many cogitations, how it was possible that Luther, being a man of God, and endued with God's Holy Spirit (as in our church he is held), could so manifestly condemn us, and our church for damned and accursed heretics, that hold him for such a man, and do teach the very same doctrine as doctrine of salvation, that he condemned for pernicious heresy? And for that it seemed to me, that my salvation, in like manner, went thereon, if we were amiss, it terrified me at the very heart, until I might have some solution of this doubt.

MY EIGHTH DIFFICULTY.

About the State of Monks, and Doctrine of Traditions.

30. Many other points there were besides these that raised great difficulties in my mind, so that I did not see possi-

* Defence, p. 73.

† Luth. Ep. ad Harvagium, tom. vii. p. 380, Witt.; and Art. 28, contra Lovanienses, tom. ii. p. 503, Witt.

bly how they could be fully answered, they were so plainly and abundantly set down, and proved by this author out of the ancient fathers and histories of the church; as, namely, that of monks, and their religious state, consisting of vows, of obedience, poverty, and chastity, such as at this day are among the Papists, is so abundantly testified by the testimonies of the said ancient fathers and practice of the first ages of Christian religion,* alleged by this author of the Defence, as it seemed not possible to be denied; whereof I collected with myself, that the difference standing only in this, that in these later times there might be some abuses, it seemed to me that the abuse doth not evacuate the true use of any thing that is otherwise lawful or commendable in itself.

31. Another great scruple was moved unto me, about this author's treating of unwritten traditions
Traditions. necessary to be observed, which, being hitherto unto me a most hateful doctrine, I was not a little afflicted to see the same so copiously proved by testimonies and examples of all the chief ancient fathers, and the same so weakly answered by our principal writers of those days; as, namely, by Mr. Dr. Fulke, in whom, and in whose writings, before that time, I had great confidence; for that he often professed to hold nothing that is not conform to the sense, judgment, and practice of the primitive church; but now this author, setting down his particular answers in one or two points, first about admitting the ancient fathers' interpretation of Scriptures, and the second concerning their opinion and judgment about traditions, I found it to be so contemptuous, and opposite to the said fathers, as it seemed to me (the places themselves being punctually observed, and his own words set down), as no one thing did trouble me more than this, for that it seemed plain unto me that his former protestations were only words that the fathers made for him, or that he esteemed them, whereof it seemed that I was forced to gather the quite contrary out of his own words, to wit, that neither the fathers were for us, nor that our men did care for

Dr. Fulke and
his manner of
writing.

The contempt
of ancient fa-
thers.

* Defence, from p. 30, downward.

them, when they made against us; and for that the matter seemed of much importance, I will set down here briefly two places of this book, concerning Dr. Fulke's manner of answering in the two proposed cases.

32. Thus, then, he writeth in the former case about the interpretation of fathers. "You may see," saith he, "now, by this little, how bootless it is to bring Scripture, when we agree not upon the interpretation."* What, then, shall we bring the ancient fathers and doctors of the primitive church for the understanding of Scripture? Shall we interpret as they do—understand it as they understood it? No, that our adversaries will not agree unto, but only in matters indifferent, and out of controversy. Wheresoever, in matters of controversy between us and them, the old fathers do make against them (as in all points they do), there will they deny their exposition. For example, the consent of ancient fathers is alleged against Mr. Fulke attributing superiority to Peter, upon the words of Christ, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church*; † but he avoideth it very lightly, thus, *It cannot be denied but divers of the ancient fathers, otherwise godly and learned, were deceived in opinion of Peter's prerogative.* ‡ St. Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Theodoret are alleged for expounding a piece of Scripture against Mr. Fulke (John v.), about Antichrist: how doth he shift it? Thus, *I answer, they have no ground of this exposition.* § St. Jerome, with all the ecclesiastical writers, are alleged for interpreting the words of Daniel, cap. vii., against the Protestants. Mr. Fulke: *I answer, that neither Jerome, nor any ecclesiastical writer whom he followeth, hath any direction out of the Scripture for this interpretation.* || St. Augustine is alleged for interpreting David's words, "He hath placed his tabernacle in the sun," ¶ of the visibility of the church. Fulke: *Austin doth wrongfully interpret this place.* ** St. Ambrose, Ephraim, and Bede are alleged for interpretation of certain scriptures. Fulke:

Now Protestants deny all fathers.

* Answer to Mr. Charke's Preface, p. 25.

† Matt. xvi.

‡ Against the Rock, p. 242.

§ Ibid.

|| Ibid.

¶ Psalm xiv.

** Against the Fortress, p. 52.

*God's word is so pitifully wrested by them, as every man may see the Holy Ghost never meant any such thing.** St. Chrysostom is alleged for certain interpretations of Scriptures. Fulke: *He allegeth, indeed, Scripture, but he applieth it madly, and yet he often applieth it to the same purpose, alas, good man!* † The consent of fathers is alleged for interpretation of certain places of Scripture of the prefiguration of the cross of Christ. Fulke: *The fathers do rather dally in trifling allegories, than soundly prove that the cross was prefigured in those places.* ‡ Thus writeth he in the first case.

Concerning traditions.

33. And in the second, about traditions, having set down divers plain testimonies of ancient fathers, both of the Greek and Latin Church, for proof, that we are bound to believe in Christian religion, not only that which is written in the Scriptures, but also sundry things that were delivered only by tradition, from hand to hand, from Christ and his apostles; he maketh this objection: But you will say (saith he) that those traditions named by the Fathers do not come down from Christ and his apostles; and how, I pray you, can you prove that to me? Why should I believe you rather than these holy fathers, which lived so long ago? § I do not see, for example sake, why I should believe a Charke or a Fulke, coming but yesterday from the grammar school, before a Cyprian, a Tertullian, a Basil, a Jerome, a Chrysostom, an Ambrose, or an Austin, especially in matter of fact, as our case is, seeing they lived more than twelve or thirteen hundred years nearer to the deed doing than these ministers do, and yet to this extremity am I driven. For hearken a little how Dr. Fulke handleth these men about traditions. St. Cyprian is alleged against him, saying, *that the mingling of wine and water in the chalice is the tradition of Christ himself.* || Fulke: *But, if Cyprian had been well urged, he would have better considered of the matter.* Tertullian is alleged, saying, *that the blessing with the sign of the*

* Against Purg. p. 202.

† Ibid. p. 237.

‡ Against the Cross, p. 146.

§ Defence, p. 158.

|| Against Martial, p. 170.

cross is a tradition of the apostles. Fulke: *Tertullian's judgment of traditions without Scripture in that place is corrupt.** St. Basil is alleged for the same matter, affirming the custom of blessing with the sign of the cross to be an apostolical tradition.†—Fulke: *Basil is an insufficient warrant for so worthy a matter.*

34. St. Jerome is alleged, saying, *that Lent fast is the tradition of the apostles.‡* Fulke: *Jerome untruly ascribeth that tradition unto the apostles.* St. Chrysostom is alleged, saying, *that the apostles decreed that in the sacrifice of the altar there should be made prayers for the departed.§* Fulke: *Where he saith it was decreed by the apostles, he must pardon us for crediting him, because he cannot shew it us out of the Acts and writings of the apostles.* But divers fathers are alleged together, besides Chrysostom, for the same matter.|| Fulke: *Who is witness that this is the tradition of the apostles? You will say Tertullian, Cyprian, Austin, Jerome, and a great many more; but I would learn, why the Lord would not have this set forth by Matthew, Mark, Luke, or Paul? Why they were not chosen scribes hereof, rather than Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Austin, and others, such as you name? But this is a counterfeit institution, and a feigned tradition.¶* And, in another place, being urged by the like, he describeth all antiquity, saying, *It is a common thing with the ancient writers to defend every ceremony which was used in their times by tradition of the apostles.*

35. Thus writeth Mr. Fulke, as he is cited and related by the author of the Defence, whereby he layeth forth largely to our consideration, what account these our men did make of the ancient fathers, and of their authority, when they stand against them. Whereupon I also fell presently into this account, whether it were more safety for me to adventure my soul with them, or with the said

* Against Martial, p. 178.

† Ibid. p. 178.

‡ Against Bristowe's Motives, p. 35.

§ Against Dr. Allen for Prayer, p. 303.

|| Ibid. p. 362 and 363.

¶ Against Bristowe's Motives, p. 306.

ancient fathers; and whether it were more probable that they should know what passed in the primitive church better than the other, or what was held for more conform to God's word. And, finally, I thought with myself, that A very grave and important consideration troubling me. if the church wherein these ancient fathers lived were the true church, then this doctrine of unwritten traditions could not be so wicked a thing, nor so prejudicial to the written word as myself and all Protestants commonly did hold it. And if that were not the true church, then could not I tell what to think, nor what to believe; for that by them we received also the Scriptures, whereof we might doubt, lest in that tradition they might no less be deceived than in others, delivering to us false or uncertain writings for true Scriptures, or at leastwise Scriptures corrupted or falsified: all which so troubled me as I thought every day a year, until I might be resolved.

MY NINTH DIFFICULTY.

About the Manner of Mr. Charke's Proceedings in answering of the Censure.

36. My last difficulty, which in this place I mean to lay forth, for that I pass over many as of lesser moment, was about Mr. Charke himself, against whom this Defence was written, who seemed to me to have dealt very weakly in the work he had taken in hand, to impugn the Censure, for that he answered not substantially to any of these difficulties, as to me it seemed, and much less in his reply to this Defence, which afterward I came to see, but received little or no satisfaction thereby, he falling into rage and extraordinary heat and injury of speech when it seemed he could not answer directly; and in this his treatise against the Censure, he sheweth not only the said passion in most places, as where he calleth certain doctrines taken out of the Jesuits' writings, *impious and blasphemous*, as particular to Jesuits, whereas indeed, upon examination, it appeareth by this Defence,

that they are common doctrines of all Papists, and much more moderate than he reporteth them to be, wherein he is shewed also not to have used sincerity and truth in reporting them, and the books whence they are taken, whereof there are divers examples set down, and these containing so plain and manifest untruths and falsehoods, voluntarily and wittingly uttered, as I conferring the places, and finding them to be such as was urged by his adversary, I was ashamed and could not tell what to say, either for mine own or other men's satisfaction.

The bad dealing of Mr. Charke increased my doubts and scruples.

37. As, for example, having set down in his first book against Mr. Campian thirteen several blasphemous doctrines, which he saith they hold in a book called "Censura Coloniensis," and every blasphemy registered in a different Roman letter, and some places of Scripture cited as opposite thereunto, when the Censure urgeth him of false dealing both in the citation and interpretation of those doctrines, he was forced to excuse himself by saying, that he indeed had not seen the book of "Censura Coloniensis," but did cite them out of one Gotvisus, a Protestant writer; of which author notwithstanding, before, he never made mention, either in the text or margin of his book. And now, upon the second reply of his adversary,* he is argued also to have corrupted Gotvisus as not citing always his report truly: and moreover, that whereas the same Gotvisus citeth two books of the Jesuits for proof of his allegations, the one, the aforesaid "Censura Coloniensis," which was not to be had (as he saith) in England, the other the large Catechism of Canisius, which everywhere was to be had, Mr. Charke citeth in his margin only "Censura Coloniensis," and suppresseth always the name of Canisius, for that by citing him, he should have taught the way how to find out the falsehood of his citations, which are by Canisius contradicted, and who setteth down the quite contrary doctrine.

38. And then further the defender sheweth the like craft and subtlety of Mr. Charke, in adding or taking away somewhat in the setting down of every doctrine: as in

* See Defence, p. 97.

the first, page 95, the Jesuits are reported to say: *It is not sin whatsoever is against the Word of God*, whereas they say only (talking of concupiscence without consent), although it suggest carnal motions against the law of God, yet is it not properly sin, if we yield not thereunto. And so, page 113, the Jesuits are reported to say of the self-same concupiscence, that albeit it be against the law of God, yet is it not sin: whereas they say not, that it is against the law of God, *but that it provoketh unto things against the law of God, &c.* And in the sixth article,

*Ansincere
dealing of Mr.
Charke.*

page 162, the Jesuits are reported by Mr. Charke to say, that *the Holy Scripture is a nose of wax*, citing for it "Censura Colonien-sis," page 117, which, as is said, was not extant in England, but he named not at all his author Gotvisus, nor Canisius' Catechism, by him cited, fol. 44, where the slander is refuted. Nay, Mr. Charke perverteth the words of Gotvisus himself, which are these: *The Jesuits say, that Holy Scripture in those things which it containeth and setteth forth, is as it were a nose of wax, not yielding any certain and immovable sentence, but such as may be wrested, &c.** So as Gotvisus doth not accuse them to call the Scripture a nose of wax, but to use the similitude, that as a nose of wax may be wrested, so may the interpretation of scriptures by wicked heretics, if there be no certain means, rule, or direction how to know the true sense.

39. These things then did trouble me much, but especially some other places plainly corrupted as it seemeth, and that wittingly and willingly, by Mr. Charke; as namely, page 123, about the aforesaid doctrine of concupiscence, where the Censure had alleged, besides the testimony of many other fathers, one most plain out of St. Augustine, saying, *Concupiscence is not sin in the regenerate, if consent be not yielded unto her, for accomplishing of unlawful works*:† Mr. Charke allegeth another authority out of St. Augustine, in the same place, that doth (as he saith) expound his meaning: for thus he writeth: *Augustine's place* (saith Mr. Charke) *is expounded by himself afterward,*

* Gotvis. in Antith. p. 217.

† Lib. I. de Nupt. et Conc. c. xxiii. xxv.

saying, *Concupiscence is not so forgiven in baptism, that it is not sin, but that it is not imputed as sin*; where the word *sin* in the first place is put in by Mr. Charke, for that St. Augustine's words are: *Dimitti concupiscentiam carnis in baptismo, non ut non sit, sed ut in peccatum non imputetur: quamvis reatu suo jam soluto, manet tamen.* [Concupiscence is forgiven in baptism, not so as that it be not (or remain not in the regenerate), but that it be not imputed as sin. It remaineth indeed, but so as the guilt which it had of sin, is dissolved or taken away by baptism.] Which last words Mr. Charke cutteth off, and putteth in the word *sin*, which altereth the whole controversy. And this I found afterward to be true by searching of St. Augustine himself.

A notable corruption of St. Augustine.

40. The other corruption seemed yet more wilful: for whereas the Censure had objected unto him that odious doctrine of Luther, that *if a woman cannot or will not prove by order of law the insufficiency of her husband, &c., let her by his consent privily lie with his brother, or with some other man.* For answer hereunto first Mr. Hamner, that wrote in like manner against the Censure, without scruple affirmeth it to be false, and that Luther never wrote any such thing; which seemed also strange to me, for so much as Mr. Charke confesseth it to be in Luther, but answereth it another way, saying: True it is, that Luther gave this evil counsel, but as he answereth himself, he did it when he was among you, *but now* (saith he) *speaking of the time after his conversion, my mind is to give other counsel.** So he. And it did put me in some comfort to hear him seem to deny it. But when I returned to the author of the Defence, I found two things evidently proved out of Luther's own words and works: first, that he was no Papist when he wrote this, though he was yet in some fear and dread of the Pope's power to punish him, whom he there calleth Antichrist,† which he would not have done (saith the defender) if he had been a Papist. The second, that the other counsel which he said he would give now, was far worse than that he gave

* See Defence, p. 56; Luth. Serm. de Matrim. tom. v. fol. 120, Wittem.

† Cum adhuc me detineret pavor Antichristi.

before: for he saith, that he would now force the husband to give consent (that his wife should lie with his brother or with some other man), and that *immissa manu in lanificium*, laying his hands upon his locks: and indeed the words import a more foul revenge, as they stand in Luther.

41. [And that you may know his constancy in this good doctrine, I will set down his own words, as they lie in his sermon of marriage, and are extant in the fifth tome of his works, where thus he writeth: *Itaque in hunc modum consului: Si mulieri ad rem aptæ, &c.** In this manner then I gave counsel: If a woman fit for the act of marriage, have an husband unfit thereunto, nor cannot publicly marry another, and yet would be loath to commit dishonesty, because the Bishop of Rome requireth about it many witnesses and much ado, she ought in this manner to speak unto her husband: "You see, good husband, that you cannot do your duty unto me, and you have disappointed my youthly body, and brought me besides in danger to lose my good name, with hinderance of my health: and you see, there is before God no marriage between us two. Be content, I pray you, that by your good leave, I may marry secretly with your brother, or next kinsman, so that still you bear the name of *being my husband*, lest your goods come into other men's hands, and suffer yourself, of your own accord, to be deceived by me, as you have deceived me against my will." I said also, that the husband ought to yield hereunto, and by these means provide her of the duty of due benevolence, and give her hope of children, which if he refuse to do, she may secretly depart from her husband into some other country, and there marry another. Such counsel then I gave at that time, when as yet I stood in fear of Antichrist. But now I would give far other counsel, and that husband which had thus craftily beguiled his wife, I would pluck him† soundly by the locks (as the proverb is): the

* Luth. Sermon de Matrim. fol. 120, tom. v., Wittenberg, A. D. 1554, and tom. vi., Germ. fol. 172.

† Vehementius lanificium immissa manu convellerem.

Luther's
ghostly coun-
sel to another
man's wife.

same I say concerning the woman that beguileth her husband, although this happen more seldom in women. In such weighty matters, as concern our bodies, our goods, honour, and salvation, it is not enough to deceive slightly our neighbour by craft, but it is necessary that he be made to pay sweetly for this his cozenage and deceit. And again in the same sermon:—"There be some women," saith he, "so froward and obstinately set, that although their husband fall ten times into incontinency, she passeth not: here it is time that the husband say thus unto his wife: 'If thou wilt not, another will; if the mistress will not, let the maid come.' So that the husband warn her twice or thrice before, and declare her stubbornness to others, that her frowardness may be known and punished before the congregation. If yet she will not, then dismiss her from thee; put away Vasthi and take Hester, as King Assuerus did."* Thus far Luther:] all which Mr. Charke leaveth out, and dissembleth, and remaineth convinced, as it seemed, of two notable wilful falsehoods: the one that Luther was a Papist when he wrote this, and the other, that he would give better counsel after, when he was a Protestant.

42. These things then lay heavily upon my heart and afflicted me exceedingly, being not able to determine what way to take. For as for Papistry, I detested the same with my soul, thinking them to be wholly amiss, and to hold the truth in no one thing that lay in controversy between us, and yet now I saw that in all these points before mentioned, they had much more reason, and we much less truth in appearance of argument, than ever I had imagined: and the slips which I had found in these learned ministers here named, Dr. Fulke, Mr. Hanmer, Mr. Charke, did make me greatly to doubt, lest they and others who wrote of controversies did not deal sincerely and truly in matters: but rather in heat of contention did strive every one to maintain any thing true or false, that made for their part or purpose which they defended: and so I came to doubt now whom I might believe or trust, and upon

say perplexity upon the slippery dealing found in Protestant ministers and their writings.

* Ibid. fol. 123.

this doubtfulness came to resolve at length to make recourse to his majesty, as before hath been said; hoping that by his means, order, and commandment, as supreme head of the church, I might be best satisfied, and quieted in mind, which Christ Jesus knoweth was my only hope and desire in this world.

CHAPTER II.

my resolution to deliver the book, entitled the "Defence the Censure," to the King's Majesty, as I did with a memorial at Greenwich on Good Friday, being the 6th April, in the year of our Lord 1604. And how I called that same day to the Council Table before my Lord of Canterbury and others.

HAVING thus wearied myself in seeking to and fro to pacify a troubled soul for the space of two or three months, and by no means able to recover my former peace of mind and assured security, concerning the certainty of my faith and assured hope of salvation, at last I began to think, what a book that hath so much troubled me, were delivered to the king's majesty, that the truth or falsehood of the contents thereof might be discovered? for now, about the time there were disputations had with the Puritans concerning their religion, or contrariety to the Protestants; the Papists had been busy to procure a toleration of their religion, which was doubted by a great many, both Catholics and Puritans, that his majesty would have granted. The king also, in his very first proclamation, seemed to be very desirous to procure an uniformity in religion in England, so that both Papist, Protestant, and Jew, might concur in one true faith; and, therefore, his majesty mentioned the calling of a general council, wherein he most especially (as I suppose) meant the settling of all controversies between Papists and Protestants.

Moreover, I conceived his majesty to be studious of the truth, for that I had often heard, he would dispute and reason himself concerning religion, being also of a good and godly dis-

*My hope of
redress from
his Majesty.*

position, of sound judgment and learning, as appeared by his books, which I had seen and greatly liked, and, therefore, I presumed he would be the more ready, upon my humble suit and request, to cause the verity of this book to be searched and sifted out, tending to so great disgrace and contempt of the first and chief Protoprotestant, Martin Luther, with Zuinglius, Calvin, Beza, and the rest his successors, not only of their lives and manners, but also of their faith and doctrines. And the rather, for that this aforesaid book (I mean the Defence), being once presented unto his majesty, would stand, methought, attending as solicitor in the name of all Papists, and as it were, at the same instant, with the Puritans, humbly craving one day of hearing for some indifferent trial of their so long suspended cause, as therein they grievously complained. So at last I resolved to deliver this book unto the king's majesty himself.

Reasons arising against my former resolution.

3. But yet sundry doubts soon crossed this resolution, as to think how unfit myself was to enterprise such a matter, and, considering my timorous and bashful disposition, to interpose myself in so weighty affairs, I being* also then one of the ministry; and besides other respects I imagined what troubles might befall me, to my great loss and hinderance both temporal and spiritual; as also I considered the book itself was, in respect of the oldness and undecent form thereof, far unmeet to be presented to any noble personage whatsoever, and much less to his majesty; neither could I possibly come to the sight of any other copy to present, with an hundred such like contradicting cogitations. At length, therefore, being pricked forward with a most earnest desire to procure some sound satisfaction and resolution of my doubts, I obliged myself by vow unto Almighty God, in my fervent prayers, daily streaming forth of the dolorous wounds of my languishing soul, thirsting after the fountain of living waters, the knowledge of the true faith leading to salvation by Jesus Christ, the way, the truth,

say how and conflict about giving up the book.

* In the first edition it is thus expressed, I being [a deacon and of the ministry].

and the life; I vowed, I say, as in the presence of Almighty God, to deliver this book unto the king's majesty for the obtaining of a full discussion of the verities or falsities thereof, and accordingly to submit myself unto the most sweet direction of his Holy Spirit; yea, though it were to yield assent unto the very Romish religion itself (which was the hardest point I could then think of), if I might rightly discern them of that religion to hold the truth, albeit my natural inclination, and habitual disposition, even shrunk hereat, and, as it were, trembled to hear my own voice often saying, *And can I then become a Papist?*

4. And further, besides the other motives aforesaid which moved me to determine to deliver this book, as also to avow the same, as before hath been said, for the most certain performance thereof, being such an enterprise as might happily procure so great and general a good if it fell out well; I was further urged thereto by a certain particular necessary cause, as I thought. For having lately before taken the oath of the supremacy, acknowledging the king to be supreme head of the church, as well in all causes ecclesiastical as temporal, I esteemed myself so bound in conscience, that if I should perceive the Roman faith to be the truth, yet I could not embrace the same, as to me it seemed, or submit myself unto a foreign power, such as the laws accounted the Pope and his supremacy to be, unless his majesty should, as it were, dispense therewith, and grant me liberty to use my conscience, which I intended to sue for at his majesty's hands.

5. Thus then, having at length as it were overcome these difficulties, I framed a certain memorial, as I may call it, wherein I comprehended, as compendiously as then I could (so many divers thoughts disturbing my obscured understanding, like to a troubled fountain, which sendeth forth no pure or pleasant water), some chief and principal causes of my doubts and difficulties before touched, and contained in that book, thereby to induce his majesty to peruse the whole book itself; desiring his highness, that if upon the examination of those things contained in that

The memorial
I made to his
Majesty.

book, it should happen to be truth, which was by that author affirmed, that then his royal clemency, for quiet of my conscience, would permit me to follow that religion, which the same author professeth; but if contrariwise he were found false in his assertions or allegations, that then, whereas his majesty had begun, as it seemed, to take some pity of the Papists' former punishments, he would now most justly extend upon them, and all their adherents, a more sharp chastisement than before, for that they would publish to the world such falsities against the truth of Christ and saints of God.

6. With this memorial, then, together with the book itself, as fitly accommodated as I could, I went often to and from London, during the time between Christmas and Easter, never finding opportunity to deliver the same, until at length, hailed thereto by my vow before mentioned, I went to Greenwich, where the court then was, upon Good Friday, being the 6th of April, in the year of our Lord 1604. And there attending his majesty's coming unto the chapel, I, among other petitioners, as he passed by, delivered the book, together with the said memorial, not unto the hands of his majesty immediately (for I could not get so near unto him, by reason of the press of people), but to Sir Roger Wilbraham, master of the Requests, who, taking it at my hands, and somewhat admiring thereat, delivered the same unto the king immediately after his coming into the chapel, which as soon as the king beheld, presently he spake aloud, and with a great oath (as was reported), smiting with his hand, said, *This is some Papist*, and presently sent forth a gentleman of his privy chamber, to inquire for him that delivered the book: to whom I answered myself to be the man. Then he (after he had walked three or four turns in the gallery, asking me sundry questions concerning my name, kindred, calling, and estate of life, as also concerning the book, wherein I was very sparing to answer him) willed me to stay there until his majesty returned, for he said it was his majesty's pleasure to speak

My petition.

Sir Roger Wilbraham, master of the requests.

What passed in the delivery of the book and my memorial.

with me. Unto whom I answered, I would willingly expect his majesty's pleasure. Neither had I intent to depart without his majesty's gracious licence and despatch of my business.

7. And now, he being returned into the chapel, and the rest of the company leaving the gallery, every man as upon that day exercising the best devotion he had, I walked alone, having no devotion to hear the sermon, but remained as the man walking between Jerusalem and Jericho,* fallen into the hands of thieves, robbed of all life of religion, sore wounded in my understanding, and half dead in all my senses and powers of my soul, expecting the present remedy and help of that good Samaritan Christ Jesus, my Saviour, who as upon that day suffered death upon the cross for my redemption, unto whom, as to my chief helper in tribulation, I commended my present business.

8. The sermon being ended, before the king came forth, the lord chamberlain came, inquiring for him that delivered the book; unto whom, as soon as I could, I presented myself; who asking me what I was, I answered, "May it please your lordship, I am a scholar." "What, are you a minister?" saith he. I answered, "No, my lord, I am a deacon." "Methinketh," saith he, "you are a Papist." I answered, "I am not yet, if it like your lordship, a Papist." So he commanded one of the grooms there present of the chamber to look unto me. I said, "My lord, I mean not to depart;" and with this my lord returned into the chapel. Then presently came flocking about me many people, of sundry sorts and fashion, and divers of the king's guard, who would needs know what was the book I delivered; what it contained; whether it were of my own making; whether it were in Latin or in English; and whether I were a Papist or no. To all which I endeavoured, as much as I could, to answer with silence; but yet they persisted in their examinations, one demanding one thing and another another. To whom at last I re-

The coming
forth and
speech of my
lord chamber-
lain.

Sundry de-
mands made
unto me.

* Luke x.

plied, that it concerned not them to know what it contained; it was a book concerning religion. Then they stood gazing and wondering about me. One said, *He thinketh he hath done a meritorious deed to-day, he need care for no more.* Another said, *By this he hopeth to redeem a soul out of purgatory.* One said, *Is he not a minister?* Another said, *He may happen be a priest.* Another said, *How durst you give a Papist's book to the king?* And another, who seemed to be a Puritan, and would presently have entered into disputation with me (being some tailor, as I supposed, or some other such like artisan or craftsman), began to insult over me and say, *Is it not a shame for a man of your years not to be settled yet in religion?* To whom I vouchsafed no answer at all. And thus every one spake his pleasure until the king's majesty was coming forth; and then the Lady Raleigh, being there present to prefer some suit for her husband, that was in the Tower, requesting me and my keeper, by earnest entreaties, not to hinder her from speaking to the king, I could not but yield thereunto, which was the occasion that his majesty passed by without speaking unto me, for that the press of people and multitude of halberds were so great, as I could scarce come to the sight of him.

9. Then I attended with my keeper in the great chamber, until word was brought unto him that he should bring me into the council-chamber after dinner, before my Lord of Canterbury (lately before of London) and his assistants; and so he did. Where being come (my lord sitting in a chair at the upper end of the council-table, with Dr. Montague, dean of the king's chapel, standing by him, and divers other clergymen, but many more gentlemen, of divers sorts, which came in from time to time), his lordship seeing me, willed me to come near, and, after some few questions about my name, state, and condition, commanded a certain gentleman (whose name I know not) to read the memorial which I gave with the book, which were both brought thither to the end (as was said) I might explain my meaning concerning my whole purpose, and particularly about a certain allusion used by me in my

My remission
for appearance
at the council-
chamber.

memorial, taken out of the twenty-first chapter of Deuteronomy, concerning the law of a strange captive woman, whereunto I fitly (as I thought) applied this book, being unto me, as it were, the voice of the Church of Rome, which divers Protestants, in their expositions of the Revelation, and I in that place, termed the woman sitting upon many waters, and the harlot of Babylon. In all which I declared my meaning, though it seemeth I was not so obscure but that his majesty himself (as I gathered after, by my lord's and Mr. Deane's talk) did rightly understand in what sense I spake. And concerning Luther, Calvin, and Beza, whom I had mentioned in my memorial and covertly glanced at, I so explained my mind out of the book (of Defence) itself, that it was little pleasing to my lord or Dr. Montague, there present, to hear it, and therefore my lord called me yet nearer, so that I stood close unto the table, insomuch that divers that were present could not hear what was spoken.

The first
speech with
my lord.

10. Then my lord, proposing many questions about the place of my dwelling, and of whom I had the book, &c., asked what moved me to deliver this book unto the king, saying, "This is a book of Parsons, that notorious traitor, from whom, I am sure, you have heard, how many treasons have proceeded against the queen in her time: if he could be taken in England, he would be soundly handled. What, had you no other book but this to deliver to the king?" &c. "Why," saith he, "I burnt I cannot tell how many of them." Whereto I answered, "May it please your grace, I know not the author of it, neither do I respect who it is that wrote it; I only desire to be satisfied concerning the truth of that which is contained in the book; for if it be true, I cannot persuade myself that we are in the truth, or right way. And yet it is well known how great an adversary I have always been to the Papists' religion to the utmost of my power, and I yet think with horror how hard a thing it is for me to be of their religion." Then said my lord, "Why, what so great matter is in this book that should move you to doubt of that religion wherein you have been brought up all your life; and that you must needs give this book to the king, above others?" I an-

Talk with my
lord about St.
Luther and
his scholars.

swered, "There be divers points of great difficulties unto me, as may in part appear by my memorial exhibited to his majesty, but much more by the book itself. And amongst other, one chief point is concerning M. Luther and his scholars, that first began this reformation (as we call it) from Papistry amongst us, of whom, as the learned of our church, Mr. Jewell, Mr. Fox, and Mr. Whitaker, and others, have written; so have I accounted him to be a man of God, and one sent to enlighten the whole world, being before drowned in the superstition of Papistry. But if he were such a one as this book sheweth him to be, one that was first moved by the devil to write against the Mass, that he had much conference with the said devil, and so great familiarity with him as to eat a bushel of salt, as (it seemeth) his own words do testify, I have reason to doubt of our religion, which should take beginning from the devil."

11. Then Dr. Montague replied, "Luther was a holy and learned man, but yet we took not our religion from him." And my lord said, "*Will you believe a lying, traitorous Papist, that practiseth nothing else but lying? They have their pia mendacia, and think it no sin to belie us that are their adversaries.* Do you not know, when two men go to law together, one will speak the worst he can against the other?" I answered, "But then the truth being known, my lord, it will redound to the greater discredit of him and his cause that belieth his adversary. And as for Luther's incredible railing," said I, "against King Henry VIII., the author of the 'Defence' quoteth the book and leaf, and setteth down his own words.* And, surely, I cannot think that any man indued with the spirit of God could speak so vilely against the person and majesty of a king as he doth; and even that alone (if it be true), though there were nothing else against him, would make me to think he was no such holy man as I believed him to be." Whereto a certain gentleman that stood thereby, who had taken up the book from before my lord, and was reading thereon, said, "Luther was somewhat rash, indeed;" which, I understanding that he had said a *rascal*, I repeated the word with admira-

* See before, c. ii. diff. 4.

tion. "Nay," quoth he, "I say not so." "But surely I must think so," said I, "if it be true, or else he would never have used such base terms, especially which that book relateth, to such a famous and worthy king as King Henry the Eighth was."

12. And here my lord spake somewhat, which I remember not, but I went forward, saying, "And besides this, Sir, if we should not regard his person, but account that as passion,* either of infirmity, or great zeal against the king, being then a Papist, though it were a great blemish in so rare a man; yet what may a man think of those foul doctrines which he taught, as that a woman might marry or lie with her husband's brother, quite contrary to the Holy Scripture, where St. John Baptist said to Herod, *It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.* And another of his doctrines is, *if the wife will not come, let the maid come,* and these appear to be truly reported of him, because Mr. Charke confesseth them, and, going about to defend the first, hath no other way but to leave out some part of Luther's words, and falsify his meaning very strangely, that I was greatly ashamed at the reading thereof, like as he dealt before with a place of St. Augustine, which made me think with myself that God's truth, if it be with us, needeth not to be defended with lies; which moved me the more, for that I do hold Mr. Charke for some especial chief learned man, having been one of the chief disputants against Mr. Campian, in the Tower; and therefore I thought, if this were true, as it seemed, of this dealing of Mr. Charke's, it might well be that he and others used the like liberty in other matters against the Papists, as the Defence complaineth very much; and this, I assure you, my lord," quoth I, "hath bred in me a great scruple of mind, not knowing whom to trust." Whereunto my lord answered, "*And will you believe all that this paltry book saith to be true?*" I answered, "If it please your grace, I desire to be certified of the truth of this book, and that it may be examined, for I was not furnished with books to examine the same, and the author thereof is so full of his quota-

About Mr.
Charke's deal-
ing.

* See c. ii. diff. 5, and Defence, p. 45.

tions of Luther's own books, for proof of that he saith, as either they must needs most of them prove true, or else he is the most impudent creature that liveth, be it Parsons, or whosoever it be."

13. And then, my lord and Dr. Montague,

looking each on other, my lord said, "This book is answered already;" and then, whilst Dr. Montague looked on the date of the impression, my lord addeth further, "*I am sure it is answered; I have burnt a number of them,*" meaning of the "Defence of the Censure." Whereunto I said, "My lord, I would gladly see that answer, and then I hope I should be fully satisfied: whereto my lord made me no answer, but spake to Dr. Montague somewhat, which now I remember not, but sure I am it was of no moment for my satisfaction, for still I urged to have the places and authorities examined. From Martin Luther we fell to talk of Mr. Theodore Beza, concerning whom I told them that the book reporteth how he sold his benefice to one, and took money for it be-

About Mr.
Beza and Mr.
Calvin.

forehand of another, and ran away with another man's wife to Geneva, with other such like behaviour. Whereto my lord said, "Beza confessed so much of himself (concerning his benefice), or else they had never known it; but their cozenings and false dealings (meaning of the Papists) go far beyond this." "And for Mr. Calvin," said I, "whom I have always revered, and employed my chiefest time of study in his book of 'Institutions,' I find him accused here to have been a false and deceitful wicked man, as that he was branded with a hot iron for filthy sodomy, and would have raised a dead man, whilst he was alive, but afterwards found him dead indeed, by his prayers and endeavours to raise him. And many such like things," said I, "are there reported of him whilst he lived, until he died most miserably, afflicted with sundry loathsome diseases,

My lord's
repl.

as did Herod and Antiochus." "Then," said my lord, "these be all lies and tales of that Bolsack; and as for sodomy, and all kind of filthiness, it is as common a thing amongst the chiefest of them to have their boys, &c., as it is amongst us

A most false
slander.

to have women." Whereto I said, " My lord, I know not what their lives may be, but the question is now chiefly of their doctrine, which, if it be true, a man may lead, I think, a good life among them if he will, though some of them be never so bad, [and there can be but one true faith and belief which is absolutely necessary to salvation ; ' for without faith,' as St. Paul saith, ' it is impossible to please God.' "]

14. Upon this Dr. Montague took occasion to speak somewhat in praise and defence of Mr. Calvin, urging me to say somewhat against any thing that I had read in his doctrine ; and by chance I remembered a place, ^{Against Mr. Calvin.} which I had observed in his " Institutions," where he scoffeth at St. Augustine and his mother Monica, for that she had demanded to be remembered by him after her death in the sacrifice of the altar,* which Mr. Calvin saith, that it was an old wife's request, which the son not considering well of, was willing to grant, and would have others to do the like ; whereby I inferred that St. Augustine seemeth to approve two doctrines of the Papists together, *the sacrifice of the Mass*, and *prayer for the dead* ; but to this Dr. Montague answered, " Tush ! I can shew you there is no such thing in St. Augustine." " Then," said I, " is Mr. Calvin a false man, that both confesseth and citeth the same ;" and with this I began to have a scruple of Dr. Montague, his conscience also, in avouching so publicly an evident untruth. [For who can think he was so ignorant or unseen in St. Augustine ?]

15. But now my lord being willing to rise, said to Dr. Montague (who had both the book and my memorial in his hand), " Well, Mr. Deane, now you can shew the king his meaning ;" and then my lord and Dr. Montague, both standing on foot, said, with a loud voice, unto me, " What, did you mean to say in your memorial, *the king is only worthy and able to open the book, as if there were nobody else could answer it* ?" Whereto I answered, yielding for my reason the scruple I made of mine oath taken to the supremacy ;" and then my lord, calling me friendly by name, said, " Well, Mr. Walsingham, I see no cause why

* Calvin's Institutions, lib. iii. c. 5, sec. 10.

^{my final dis-}
^{mission from}
^{my lord at}
^{this time.} I should commit you to prison. Have you any friends in the court that will be bound for your appearance?" I answered, "No, my lord, none whom I would willingly trouble upon such an occasion." Then he asked me if I would promise him to come to his house at Lambeth the next day. I answered, saying, "That I will, my lord, by God's help:" then he did conjure me, as I would answer at the day of judgment, that I should not fail. I told him I would not. And thus I was dismissed. And as I was going in the throng after my lord, out of the council-chamber, some one that came behind me spake somewhat loud unto me, saying, "*Teneto fidem tuam;*" [for he thought, belike, I had been then a Catholic,] which comforted me at the heart, but I could not well discern who it might be. And so I went somewhat more cheerfully that night from the court towards London.

CHAPTER III.

What order my Lord of Canterbury took with me, both by fair means and foul, for my satisfaction, upon my second appearance before him at Lambeth, the next day after, being Easter Eve.

THE next day morning, being Easter Eve, I went to Lambeth; where being admitted into my lord's presence in his gallery, he bid me favourably welcome; and, after some private speech, commanded one to call Dr. Covell, his chaplain, unto him. When he was come, my lord said unto him, "Here is one that is fallen into some doubts by reading a Papist's book, 'The Defence of the Censure;' take him to you, and see if you can satisfy him; he is willing to confer." So leaving my lord in the gallery, I went with Mr. Doctor to his chamber; and being come thither, he began to ask me concerning my name, dwelling, calling, and proceeding in this matter, being nothing willing, as it seemed, to talk with me of any further argument; but yet, in process of much speech, we came to talk of Papists and their religion in general, but nothing to my purpose, until I began to speak of the church, saying, "It seemeth to me very strange that the church of Rome should be so fallen into heresy and superstition, as we hold, seeing our Saviour promised to be with his church unto the end of the world,* and to send his Holy Spirit, which should lead it into all truth." Then Mr. Doctor said, "Christ hath always been with his church, and hath preserved some true believers in all ages." "But you yourself," said I, "do write, in your book against the Puritans,† that doubtless the church of Rome was once the light of

my lord's
speech to Dr.
Covell.

Dr. Covell's
book.

* Matt. xxviii.; John xiv.

† See afterward, cap. x.

the world for many ages; and the king's majesty, in his speech at the parliament, now in print, calleth her the Mother-church, which must needs import, that once she was the true church; and therefore it seemeth, that either she endureth so still, or else that Christ did forsake this true church, and permit her to fall into heresy and superstition (which seemeth expressly against his own promise in the Gospel), if it be true that the church of Rome be fallen into idolatry and blasphemous heresies, as we say."

A point seriously to be considered.

My conference with Dr. Covell.

2. Then said Mr. Doctor: "I do not condemn all the doctrine of the church of Rome; I know they teach many good things, but yet they hold some opinions contrary to the Scripture." I answered: "If they do hold any points against the Scripture, they cannot be the true church; for that she holdeth nothing but truth, being, as St. Paul saith, the pillar and ground of truth;* and, moreover, they have many excellent learned men among them, such as you yourself greatly commended in your book, and they, belike, can discern no such errors to be in their doctrine against Scripture; and, furthermore, do allege not only Scripture, but say that all the ancient fathers did acknowledge and confirm their doctrine. And whereas you say that Christ had always some true believers, it seemeth (that some) in so great a multitude of Christians cannot well stand for a Catholic church." Dr. Covell answered: "The fathers make as much for us, as for them, though in many things they followed the time wherein they lived, and in continuance of time men have attained to more light." Which answer satisfied nothing at all my understanding; condemning the fathers as accommodating themselves unto the times, which is to evacuate all their authority, and the authority of the church throughout all times.

3. Many such like speeches Mr. Doctor uttered, but very coldly, as seemed not to proceed from his heart. "But," said I, "concerning this book, Sir; I would gladly make trial of the truth thereof;" and then I took out my notes and collections, which I had gathered out of

* 1 Tim. iii.

the Defence, saying, "I pray you, let me see some of Luther's works, if you have any. I would fain see that 'De Missa Privata.'" "I think I have it," saith Mr. Doctor; and so he went into his study, and at length finding it, brought it forth. Then I began to speak of Luther's conference with the devil; and turning over a leaf or two of the book as it lay before us in the window, I light upon the same place cited by the Censure, and began to read, until Mr. Doctor interrupted me, and, turning away from the book, said: "Tush! you see I have this book and many such like, and I never regard them; this hath lain by me I know not how long," &c. I answered: "But surely, Sir, if I had known it, or could have seen it before now, I should have regarded it, and considered well of it." And this seemed enough to me, for I had as much as in this matter I desired; the thing being plain, that Luther had this story of his conference with the devil in his own writings, which my Lord of Canterbury and Dr. Montague before ascribed to the pious lies of the Papists. But Mr. Dr. Covell, flying from this, persisted in sundry other discourses, saying: "Why, I have myself divers of mine own friends and kindred that are that way minded towards Papistry, and yet it doth not move me. I assure you, Mr. Walsingham, if I were persuaded that it were the truth, there should no promotion nor any thing else cause me to forsake it," &c.

4. To this, though I answered little, yet I thought the more, and that promotion was not so lightly esteemed by him; for that as soon as ever he perceived that I was not satisfied by these his words, he shewed himself not a little offended, wishing that he had never known me, for that he should receive, as he said, discredit by having talked with me and not satisfied me; and with this he left me and went to my lord, it being now dinner-time. And when my lord and his company were set at table, I was convited, and called in also by one of his gentlemen to dine there, and by my lord's commandment placed at the end of his own table, right over against him, who used me that day with extraordinary courtesy, sending me from his

About Luther's
conference with
the devil.

own dish, and commanding divers particular favours to be used towards me; and, namely, he sent me down his own bowl of rice, and carved unto me fish, but offered me no flesh, though there was some at table. No matter of argument or dispute fell out at that dinner, though I somewhat suspected that some things would have been said concerning me and my cause. There was also present Sir Christopher Perkins, whom if I had known (as after I understood) to have been a Jesuit many years, it would have given me matter to muse upon.

*A contempla-
tion of mine
in the great
chamber at
Lambeth.*

5. But after dinner, walking up with Mr. Doctor into the great chamber, I found there another matter of greater musing, among other cogitations occurring for three or four hours together, which was the pictures of all the kings of England in their proper habits, of whom, among other [sundry cogitations concerning them and the religion which they all professed, which was Papistry,] I considered how simple and plain they were until King Henry VIII., who first of all began to alter, or doubt, at least, of the religion which they all professed unto his time; and when, after long expectation, I saw myself not called, nor any come to me again for giving me satisfaction in my doubts, I began to think there was more difficulty in them than I myself had hitherto conceived; and so at length being wearied to expect any longer, I thought best to repair to Dr. Covell's chamber, to know what was my lord's pleasure of me; who going and returning, brought me word that I might go home into the country until my lord should send for me again. And so I departed, marvelling not a little at my so slight and sudden dismissal; whereof yet afterward I perceived the cause, and felt the effects.

CHAPTER IV.

Of my third and fourth Appearance before my Lord at Lambeth, and how differently he proceeded with me from the first and second time.

BUT now I was no sooner dismissed and gone, but my lord, whether called upon by the king, or otherwise entering into deeper apprehension of the matter than before, he asked the next day of his chaplain, Dr. Covell, what was become of me? and perceiving I was dismissed, was exceeding angry, and gave commandment that I should be sought out and brought back again with all diligence: whereupon Dr. Covell, besides the sending of some to seek me in London, sent also another to the Commissary of St. Alban's, near unto whom I dwelt, charging him to seek me out, which made a great noise in all that country. But I was met withal two days after, walking in Paul's, without cogitation of this matter, and so was presently brought to Mr. Dr. Covell where he then was, and with him passed to Lambeth again; whereof Mr. Doctor was very glad, and I not sorry, thinking that now I should have some good satisfaction indeed in all my doubts.

2. But as soon as I came, I perceived that my lord's countenance towards me was changed; for I being brought by Dr. Covell before him into his study, where was also the aforesaid knight, Sir Christopher Perkins, as soon as I came into his presence, I beheld my lord's countenance framed to be angry. "How now, sirrah!" saith my lord; "how chance you went away in that manner the other day?" "May it please your grace," said I, "Mr. Dr. Covell told me it was your lordship's pleasure I should go home, until your grace sent for me." My lord said, "I gave no such order. Dr. Covell is a wise man." Dr. Covell said,

The archbishop's speech unto me.

"I understood your grace so." Then my lord, turning to the knight, said, with an angry countenance, "As soon as I came to the court to-day, the first word the king spake unto me, he asked me what I had done with him that delivered the book. You are a fellow indeed! we have dealt too gently with you; thou art a bold companion, to deliver such a book to the king." Then I began to speak, and to yield my reasons thereof; but my lord proceeded in his wrathful speeches, and, after many fierce and angry words, he added: "I will even send thee to Bridewell; thou art worthy to be set on the pillory, and to have thine ears cut off for a libelling knave as thou art." I answered: "May it please your grace, I hope I have not deserved any such punishment. I have set my name to that which I have written; I desire you, my lord, but to be taught the truth." My lord said: "Thou be taught! thou art a foolish, bold knave, and I will handle thee as thou art, before I have done with thee."

The knight in the corner. 3. So when my lord had chafed and spoken largely his mind, thinking he had now put me in bodily fear, the knight in the corner began to speak, and say, "My lord, he will be better advised. Mr. Walsingham, I dare say, is sorry for his rashness; you shall see he will conform himself, and behave himself as he should." But my lord yet still continued in his rough and angry terms, saying: "No man, forsooth, will serve you but the king to deal withal!" I answered: "May it please your grace to consider my reasons why I came chiefly to the king." Then said my lord: "Why, what hast thou to do with the king? What careth the king if thou wert hanged, like a foolish knave as thou art?" with many other such like vehement and threatening speeches; but yet, in the end, he said, "Come near," (for that all this while I stood aloof).

4. And then he called for his secretary or notary, saying, with indignation, to me, "Come, come you hither; I will examine you further than I have done yet; I have but dallied with you hitherto; come on, take your oath." Whereto I said, "It shall not need to exact any oath at

my hands, for I will answer nothing but truth to any thing your grace shall ask me, without my oath." Then said my lord, "Grace me no grace; come, I will have thee swear, and I will handle thee as thou art." So I was examined upon mine oath, how I came by the book, whether anybody else had dealt with me herein, and such like. To all which I answered truly but negatively (for in truth hitherto I had never dealt with any Papist at all). Then he further urged me, saying, "What was your meaning by delivering the book to the king?" I answered, "My lord, I expressed my meaning and cause in that memorial which I gave with the book." "What!" saith he, "but you thought to convert the king, belike? Did you think the king would believe all the lies in that book, as well as yourself?" I said, "My lord, I did not weigh nor consider his majesty's judgment by my own, and my only desire is, to know whether they be lies or no; for then were I satisfied." My lord urged me still, saying, "But what did you think?" I answered, "I had so many and divers thoughts, my lord, as I cannot precisely say what I thought." My lord said, "Nay, you thought to do some notable act, I am sure; you thought to make the king a Papist, forsooth; come, I will have you tell me what you thought." Whereunto I answered (forasmuch as he urged me so eagerly, and that upon mine oath), that albeit I had no express intention either to make his majesty or myself a Papist thereby, yet did I hope that, if by his sound judgment I should find any one of these things true that are alleged, he would cause the rest to be searched, and so myself to be satisfied.

The archbishop's interrogations after I was sworn.

5. And now my lord's anger beginning to be somewhat assuaged, the knight in the corner said, "If it please your lordship, you shall see Mr. Walsingham will be better advised, and conform himself as well as ever he did, after he shall have conferred with some learned man." My lord said, "Why, Dr. Covell here hath talked with him; what say you of him?" Dr. Covell said, "I have had but little talk with him; he will talk of nothing but concerning that book; he stands altogether thereupon, and the points

My conference
before my Lord
of Canterbury.

therein contained." Whereto I replied, saying, "Dr. Covell shewed me Luther's book, 'De Missa Privata,' wherein he confesseth he had conference with the devil, as the Defence affirmed of him, and therefore I think he could not be a man of God that should enlighten the world," &c. "Why," said my lord, "we do not build our faith nor religion upon Luther." "Then," said I, "is there Beza also, whom I took to be a most reverend and holy man; he wrote such vile and lascivious verses as is incredible." My lord said, "What if he did make such verses when he was in his youth, and Beza was a Papist when he was a young man, do you not know how St. Paul was a great persecutor of God's church, yet after became an holy apostle?" I answered, "But if it please your lordship, St. Paul was no persecutor after he became an apostle; and further, if we should pardon Beza in his youth, yet the book saith he became worse after he was a man of years and a Protestant, and not better; as taking another man's wife, killing his own child which he begat of his maid, and many such, whilst he lived in Geneva." And further I added, how Dr. Bolsack, the writer of the story, protesteth before God and all his holy angels, in the beginning of his book, that he setteth down nothing upon malice, or that is false, and therefore he dedicated his books to the magistrates of Geneva, that they might make trial of that which he had written, both concerning Calvin and Beza. And as for that concerning Beza, he wrote whilst he himself was alive (as the Defence saith), that he might the better answer for himself; but we never heard that he convinced Bolsack of any lies or false reports. "And is it probable that any man will damn himself, my lord," said I, "that he may disgrace or discredit another?" But my lord answered, "Tush! these are all Bolsack's lies, a renegade fellow; I have burnt a number of his books."

6. And with this he rose from his place, and walked into the inner part of his study, giving, as it were, place of purpose for some others to interpose themselves, and to take up the matter, which they did. For presently came the foresaid knight and Dr. Covell about me, the knight

saying, "Well, Mr. Walsingham, I hope you will be advised; my lord will use you favourably;" with some other few words to the same effect, which seemed to me a strange speech of one that had been a priest, and, as some say, a professed Jesuit, to stand so much upon temporal favour in points concerning the soul. And then Dr. Covell said, "You see, Mr. Walsingham, how angry my lord was; I would wish you not to be obstinate, and you shall see my lord will deal the better with you." I answered, "Why, Mr. Doctor, I hope my lord shall have no cause to deal hardly with me, for I am willing to confer with any; but I cannot be satisfied with any conference but the trial of the truth of the citations in this book."

Dr. Covell's
and the knight's
counsel.

7. Then my lord, coming towards us, said, "Why, if you stand so much upon books, I can shew you enough; you shall want no books: will you read one that I shall lend you, other gates books than that lying fellow's libel?" I answered, "Yes, if it please your grace to shew them me, and humbly thank your lordship for the same." Then my lord called to one to fetch forth two books of Mr. Thomas Bell's, one entitled "Anatomy of Popish Tyranny," and the other, "The Survey of Popery;" which being brought, my lord said, "Here are two books; will you read these? You shall see what he saith here to the Papists." I answered, "If it please your lordship, I will read them willingly." And furthermore my lord asked me if I had read Mr. Jewell's and Mr. Harding's books? I answered, "No, my lord, I have read Mr. Jewell's only." "Why," saith he, "you might have taken those books to read rather than this, and so you should have dealt more indifferently, and have seen what had been said on both sides; but to go take such a paltry book as this (meaning the 'Defence of the Censure'), it was a very foolish part indeed." But I stood still in this, to have the doubts and difficulties answered which I had gathered out of this book.

8. Then my lord returned to his former place, perusing my examination before taken, and added this also to my former oath, as he said, *that I should be bound to read*

through both those books of Bell, and return with them unto his lordship at the latter end of the next term following. Whereunto I subscribed. But saith Dr. Covell at the same instant, "My lord, if it please your grace, you may swear him not to depart the land without some license or notice thereof, given to your lordship." Whereto, as I remember, my lord answered, "Why, he will come again, and then we will see further, and, I trow," saith he unto me, "by that time you have read these books, and marked them well, you will have no mind to be a Papist." "I will see, my lord, what he saith," said I. "Then," said my lord, "come again to me to-morrow, and I will write to Mr. Rolfe, the commissary, concerning you." And thus, for that present time, I was dismissed.

*The suggestion
of the devil and
Dr. Covell.*

9. The next day morning I repaired again to my lord, who then had put on a more mild and familiar countenance, and calling me near unto him, said, "Mr. Walsingham, you must be wary and advised, and not run too far into these matters of controversy beyond your reading and knowledge. It is good you conferred with some that be learned. Let me see, whom do you know that you would desire should talk with you?" I answered, "If it please your grace, I do not know many; but whom your lordship shall think meet I shall be willing to attend." Then said my lord, "Are you acquainted with the Dean of Paul's?" "No, my lord," said I. "Nor with the Dean of Westminster," saith he, "Dr. Andrews?" I said, "I am not known unto him, my lord, but I have often heard him preach before he was Dean of Westminster; he is held, indeed, to be very learned." Then my lord, pausing awhile, said, "What ministers have you near about where you dwell that are well accounted of?" "I know none, my lord," said I, "of any great note near us." Then my lord said, "Well, I will write to Mr. Rolfe, that you may be conferred withal; how say you, you are willing to confer?" "Yes, my lord," said I, "I am very willing to abide any good order your lordship shall appoint me." Then said my lord, "I will write so to the commissary, that he shall not trouble or hinder you in any

thing;" and so, calling for pen and ink, wrote his letters, and having ended, said, "Here, I have written very favourably for you; you shall hear what I have written." And then my lord read his letter unto me, the sum whereof was this:—

10. *Whereas the bearer hereof seemeth to be somewhat inclined towards Popery, we will that you appoint some grave and learned divine, who may confer with him, and satisfy him in his doubts: but let all things be so done, as that he may not be discouraged, nor his infirmity divulged.* Then said my lord, "You see what I have written, nothing that can any way prejudice you; for you may confer with some learned man or other, which Mr. Rolfe shall direct you unto; and I doubt not but, by that time you come again, you will be well resolved, and conform yourself." "I hope so, my lord," said I. "You go to church?" said my lord. "Yes, and if it please your lordship," said I. "Why, that is well," said my lord. And thus, having received my lord's letter, and humbly taken my leave of his lordship, he bid me farewell; and then taking my leave of Doctor Covell, he spake very kindly unto me, saying, "I hope when you come again, Mr. Walsingham, you will be of another mind, and all shall be well." And so from Lambeth I passed to London, and from thence, the next day, into the country, somewhat to satisfy the longing expectation of my friends, and to appease somewhat the rumours raised about me.

The sum of
my lord's letter
for me to the
commissary of
St. Albans.

CHAPTER V.

How I, being dismissed by my Lord of Canterbury, with two books of Mr. Bell, I returned into the country; and what cogitations I had by the way, and what happened unto me there with the commissary; and of the reading over of one of Mr. Bell's volumes, entitled, "The Anatomy of Popish Tyranny;" and what I found therein.

WHEN I was thus despatched by my lord, and in my way homeward, I began to think of divers matters; and among other, of the manner of my despatch, how I had been treated by my lord and his doctors in divers sorts, first by fair means and then by foul, and that in neither of them I had obtained that which I most desired, and my soul had especial need of; to wit, to be satisfied of my doubts, whereof neither I had time to propose, nor they patience to hear, more than a piece of one or two of them, and that with such interruption as you have heard: nor found I any man willing (as to me it seemed) to enter charitably and soundly into the examination of the doubts that I had conceived. Whereupon I began to distrust with myself, and to suspect that matters went not so soundly of our side as I had hitherto persuaded myself, if authority of state were set aside, and things discussed simply by truth of learning; the which I was moved, by this I had heard and seen, to follow and seek out more than ever before.

A doubtful perplexity of mind.

2. And first of all, I was now as good as fully persuaded that the foul things written by Luther, of himself, Zuinglius, and others, about the conference with the devil, and the like, as also many of those things, at least, that are written of Calvin and Beza,

were true; and thereof did infer with myself for certain, that the first founders of our religion, in these ages, were no saints, nor holy men, nor, consequently, could have the spirit of God in them (which cannot stand with the spirit of the devil), at leastwise in that measure which is required for so high an enterprise as is the reforming of religion in matters of doctrine and life; and upon this I stood long, and my soul trembled to think of it, and yet could not get from it, for still it came to my mind that God, having choice of virtuous men, would never use such bad people and scandalous persons to begin and plant so great a good as we hold our new religion to be.

3. Secondly, I did consider that Papists stood much more upon simplicity of truth in their church than we do, for that they reject all sorts of sectaries that dissent from them in any point of faith determined by the church; but we, as appeared by this conference, do hold Luther, Zuinglius, and such others, to be brethren of our church, though we condemn their doctrine in divers points; which seemed to me to be repugnant to all reason, and to the purity and unity of faith that ought to be in a true church, whereby all must be saved that are saved in that church. But yet again, on the other side, it seemed to me impossible that Luther, dying in all the points of his faith, and Zuinglius and Calvin in theirs, and I in mine, so different among themselves, as our books do shew, though all Protestants, that we should all be saved together, as by one and the selfsame faith; especially remembering that saying of St. Paul: *One Lord, one faith, one baptism, &c.** Whereupon I determined to discuss this matter further.

4. And now, remembering the two books that I had received from my lord, with obligation of oath to read them, as also the commission to peruse not only Mr. Jewell, but Mr. Harding also, that writeth against him, I purposed to perform both the one and the other in due time; and so, coming home, I repaired within a day or two to Mr. Rolfe, the commissary of St. Albans, delivering unto him my Lord of Canterbury's letter, before mentioned; who, first marvelling much at

Mr. Rolfe,
commissary of
St. Albans.

* Ephes. iv.

the matter, and then conferring with me about the man which should be fit for our purpose to answer my doubts, we could agree upon none more fit for the purpose than one Dr. Downham.

Mr. Dr. Downham, a preacher that dwelt some twenty miles off, and had written a book, and dedicated the same unto his majesty, wherein he would prove that the Pope was Antichrist, which was some special motive (as it seemed) unto the commissary to appoint him to give me satisfaction; and for that he was to be at a certain visitation within a few days after, we agreed to expect that opportunity of meeting and conference.

5. And so, not to be idle in the mean space, I read over one of Mr. Bell's works before I went to the said visitation, which was entitled "*The Anatomy of the Popish Tyranny, divided into four books;*" and the argument or subject thereof was, to lay open all the bitter speeches and contentions that had passed, from time to time, between the priests and Jesuits, about their obedience to the archpriest, which he saith he set down out of their own books and adversary writings, with certain notes thereupon of his own, which he calleth *grave and golden advices*, and some *excellent and golden corollaries*;* which, albeit he related with these words of protestation: *It shall never be proved, God willing, saith he, that I write any untruth of any man living: God is my witness, that is far from my meaning*; yet the manner of his relating them seemed such to me, as devoid of all charity and upright meaning, in publishing so scandalous a treatise.

The sum of Mr. Bell's Anatomy.

6. For first I considered that, albeit those things were written in heat of contention between priest and priest and some religious (whereof, notwithstanding, I doubted divers times, not having the original books by me, nor knowing where to have them), yet it appeared that they were not contentions or dissensions in points of their religion; but only whether the archpriest were sufficiently instituted, or whether they that obeyed or impugned his institution were most in fault, and the like; and, consequently, whether one part, or both, or all, were in fault, it made little to my purpose, or to Mr. Bell's

* Bel. Anatom. f. 164.

either; for so much as it concerned no difference or disagreement at all in doctrinal points of religion, as I have now said. And if it had, yet were these priests and English Jesuits but a few in respect of their whole church throughout Christendom; and therefore methought that this work was to little purpose, either written by Mr. Bell or delivered to me by my lord, for disgracing of all Papists and their religion. For in equity of conscience it seemed to me no reason that contentions and fallings-out of private men, about civil matters and manners, should be alleged or much urged for arguments in points of religion.

7. But yet being bound by oath to read it over, I had patience to continue therein, though with much loathsomeness to hear so much dross gathered together out of men's passionate speeches and writings one against the other; and Mr. Bell's *golden advices*, and his *excellent golden collaries*, seemed to me one of the worst parts thereof; for that they contained nothing else but inferences and interpretations that seemed to proceed of much malice; and therefore oftentimes I made

My conceit of
Mr. Bell's
writings.

this reflection with myself: How is it possible that this man can call God to witness so solemnly, as before he doth, *that he writeth no untruth of any man living*? for that infinite things by him related are so exaggerated and amplified against all their whole religion, as they must needs be untruths; at least many of them in the sense he uttereth them. As for example, in his third book, p. 107, he hath this note in the margin: *The King of France murdered by the Jesuits*;* meaning of the late King Henry the Third; and yet he could not but know that he wrote an untruth therein; for that all the world knoweth it to be false. And he not only affirmeth it, but frameth also thereon three grave advices (to use his words), *greatly*, as he saith, *to be marked*. First, that the Jesuits are *blood-thirsty companions*; 2nd, that they are murderers, not only of mean men, but of *bishops, cardinals, kings, and popes*; 3rd, that if any baron, earl, duke, king, emperor, or pope, shall cross them, then shall they be sure to have *such a fig*, quoth he, *for their restorative Catholic ante-*

* Anatom. l. 3, p. 107.

Mr. Bell's note of antepast. *past, as they shall never have need of a Christian preservative postpast, so common and continual, saith he, are their murders; which yet methought was hard to believe, in so literal a sense as he putteth them down.*

8. And in another place (p. 34) he writeth, that Holt the Jesuit, and his companions in Flanders, did gather from the Catholics in England such an infinite mass of money, for dispensations and other such uses, as it exceeded the sum of fifty thousand pounds English, which maketh, saith he, *two hundred millions of Italian scutes* (more, perhaps, than all the princes of Europe together do possess): and this he writeth not in figures (whereby some error in account may be suspected), but at large in letters. And albeit he could not, in conscience, but think it not only untrue, but also impossible, yet maketh he this note upon the fact: *Note here, gentle reader, saith he, the wealth, pride, and saucy, deceitful dealing of the Jesuits.* And in the margin he hath this apostrophe to them: *O ye Jesuits, where is your vow of poverty?* So, as it seemed to me, that he would have this overlash to be believed of his reader for truth, which little agreeth with his former protestation of sincerity. And yet I cannot think but that it was mistaking in him, though joined with much temerity and passion, as you see by his inference; and I was much moved thereby to mistrust his manner of writing.

9. I do willingly pretermit almost infinite such like absurdities found in that book, wherewith I was well wearied before I came to the end. And truly I did marvel with myself, how my Lord of Canterbury could suffer such an exceeding railing and infamatory book to lie in his study, and much more, that he would bestow it upon me to breed a good spirit in me; which seemed, for the spitefulness of style and wickedness of matter therein contained, to be fitter to frame the disposition of a devil in a man (as I have since considered) than to quiet or resolve a man's conscience in matters of religion.

10. And being in this disgustful state, it was my chance, or rather God's providence, that I should make a

journey with a certain friend of mine to a place where I had occasion to inquire of a good, grave gentleman what this Bell should be (for hitherto I had not known the man), who in a few words gave me sufficient light of him; by whom, as also by further notice afterward had by other means, I understood that he was a Yorkshireman, and, as men say, of a town called Raskall; and out of that had been made minister, and afterward, casting off his ministry, became a Catholic, and so hot and eager in that profession, as he was cast into York gaol, where he suffered much, and was more troublesome to the keeper than all the rest of the prisoners together. After that, getting out, he went to Rhemes, and thence to Rome; and there, after some years of study, was made priest, though always, as they say, of a fiery, turbulent, and quarrelling nature; so far forth, as they report, that when other matter of contention wanted, he would frame quarrels upon his rubrics for saying his office; and so, returning into England, continued the same vein of dissension, first with other priests, about going to church and other like points; but afterwards, falling into licentiousness of life, and seeing himself mistrusted and hated of all for that cause, and especially fearing a sentence of personal excommunication that was said to be coming against him from the Pope, by Cardinal Allen's procurement, he resolved to break off from them altogether, and to become an open enemy; which seemed to me somewhat like to that vocation which the "Defence of the Censure" doth note to have been in Luther, Calvin, Beza, and some others, upon disorder of their lives and manners. It came to my mind, in like manner, what the historiographer Socrates doth write out of Eusebius about the cause of the apostasy of Porphyry, the philosopher, and his eager and bitter writing against the Christians, whereof once he was one.

How I informed myself of Mr. Bell's state and condition.

11. "The same happened unto him," saith Socrates,* "that did to Julian the Apostate; for that he, being reprehended by certain Christians for defects of his, which he, through the fierce and

Causes of apostasy in Julian and Porphyry.

* Socrat. l. 2, Hist. c. 19.

fiery heat of his natural anger, not being able to bear, he left the Christian religion, and for hatred of them who reprehended him, he ran headlong to writing of books full of all cursed and contumelious speeches against Christians." So Socrates. And the same Porphyry, writing the life of Plotinus, his master, confesseth his own furious nature to have been so terrible, as he thought sometimes to kill himself; but that Plotinus sent him forth of Rome, after eighteen years he had lived there. And Bell's mission from the same place seemed to me to have had little better effect, if we compare writing with writing, and choler with choler.

12. And as for those writings by sundry priests against the archpriest and Jesuits, which gave him the argument of his intemperate Anatomy, wherewith I confess I was greatly scandalized, and moved to aversion from their religion for a time; yet afterward, inquiring further of the matter, I was credibly informed that Mr. Watson, who was the chief dealer and greatest publisher of those contentions, did heartily repent him thereof at his death, confessing that he had greatly wronged those men, by the instigation of some who were too far blinded with passion against them; which did somewhat pacify the aversion that I had taken. But howsoever the thing was, I could not but utterly dislike the uncharitable manner of uttering those things by Mr. Bell; so as the reading over of this his book wrought no other effect in me, but only a great dislike both of the matter, and writer that could make a volume of such foul and unsavoury stuff, and no less of their sinister intentions that put the book into my hands, wherein I scarce found any thing worth a modest man's reading, and much less writing. And often there came unto my mind that piece of the grammar verse, *rabula, lixa, lanista*; the first for the excessive railing, the second for the baseness and filth of the matter, the third for the idle strifes and contentions by him recounted.

13. And surely I do marvel what gust my Lord of Durham (now of York) could take in having such a book dedicated unto him (for to him it was dedicated); albeit I considered that, being thrust upon him by the

author, he could not well refuse it, whether he liked it or no. I shall, for a taste of his spirit and style, set down here some few lines out of his Epistle Dedicatory: *Unto the reverend father, the ornament of learning and religion, Toby, the wise, grave, religious, and virtuous Bishop of Durham.* "I have employed," saith he, "my industry and wits, to couch, in a small volume, the sum and effect of all their books, &c. The disloyal Papists and blood-thirsty Jesuits have already kicked against my former labours; their holy father, the Bishop of Rome, hath thundered out his curse against me; but neither secular priests nor religious Jesuits will, or can, make any sound answer to any of my books; they have often been buzzing about the matter, yet never durst they publish so much as but one colourable answer, either to all or any of my books; so as I must needs think, that malediction, cursing, and railing will be their morning and evening song against me, by reason of this my friendly posey, which I present as a most redolent odour to their nose gravity, so often as they shall kiss the shoe of their Pope," &c. And again: "The traitorous Jesuits and Jesuited Papists will, no doubt, become stark mad, and fetch all their Romish friscols against me, &c. I have resolved, after mature deliberation, to dedicate this work to your reverend name, as to that virtuous Toby, who is able with the perfumes of the heart and liver of a fish, &c., to vanquish all the Asmodean Jesuits upon earth, and to strike such terror into their hearts, as they shall not once dare to grunt or bark against me," &c.

Mr. Bell's
words to my
Lord Toby
Matthew,
Bishop of
Durham.

14. Thus much I thought good to allege out of the said Epistle Dedicatory, thereby to let the judicious reader see how little cause I had to be moved or resolved in religion, or in any of my doubts proposed, by reading this man's book written of such an argument, and in such a style as you have seen, for that the writer's spirit seemed so base unto me, and the subject so contemptible, as it often brought to my mind the foresaid town's* name, where the author was born. And gladly I could have

* Raskall, in Yorkshire.

cast the book both from my sight and memory, but yet that it was commended and commanded unto me by Lord of Canterbury, as before hath been said, I for myself to patience to go through it, from the first line to the last, though it seemed unto me much loss of time and loathsomeness of labour to continue so long the view of such foul and ungrateful stuff.

CHAPTER VI.

Of my Journey to the Visitation at Baldock to meet with Mr. Doctor Downham, for conference about my doubts, and what passed therein, and what satisfaction he gave me, both there, and at his house.

AND now the time appointed by Mr. Commissary for my conference with Doctor Downham being come, I repaired to the visitation, where all the ministers of that diocese were present, and so Mr. Doctor accepted of this business, though with no great willingness of mind, as it appeared, but that it was imposed upon him by the commissary, being to appoint whom he esteemed fittest and most sufficient by my lord's authority. But, after a while, Mr. Doctor, walking aside into the churchyard, began to ask me what was the thing I desired to be resolved on? I answered, "Sir, I would gladly know which were the true church of God, wherein I might safely hope to attain eternal life. Great controversies there are," said I, "between the Papists and our learned men in England. They affirm that the Church of Rome is the true mother-church, teaching the true faith and religion ^{his first speech with Dr. Downham.} planted by Christ and his apostles, confirmed by miracles, deduced by succession of bishops and pastors; and that our Church of England is heretical and newly sprung up of late years, as proceeding from Zuinglius and Calvin, and the first original of all Protestancy to have been from Luther, before whom, they say, there was never Protestant heard of."

2. "No!" saith Mr. Doctor; "then, what were the Waldenses, and Wickliff, and the Albigenses,* that were

* Of these men and their different doctrines, read the Treatise of three Conversions, p. 2, c. 10, n. 26, 27, &c.; and the Protestant's Apology, tract 2, c. 2, sect. 3.

so long before Luther? The Church of Rome, whatsoever she hath been in the beginning of the primitive church, yet it is very manifest that now she is that whore of Babylon sitting upon her seven hills," and so forth; entering into a long discourse out of the Revelations, affirming that the Pope was Antichrist and the man of sin, that persecuteth the church of Christ, whereof himself having written and printed an especial book, as hath been said, no marvel if he had his phrases ready in that matter. I answered, "Why then, Sir, belike Christ hath not performed his promise, *that he would be with his church unto the end of the world, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it,*"* which they of the Roman religion say, must needs follow if he permitted it to fall into idolatry, and left it only to the Albigenses, Waldenses, and Wickliffians, held, as they say, for condemned heretics in their days; and not agreeing in religion, either among themselves or with us." Then said Mr. Doctor, "Yes; Christ hath been always with his church, and hath preserved his elect in all ages, who have not followed Antichrist, nor worshipped the image of the beast, &c. You have met with some Papist's book or other, that with lies do seek to seduce many, and to draw them from the truth of Christ's gospel."

3. Whereupon I granted that I had read a certain book entitled the "Defence of the Censure," which I confessed had driven me into many doubts; and, among other special matters, I declared, how that book proveth Luther, whom I esteemed to be a man of God, to have been rather a very bad man, and to have opposed himself against the Church of Rome by the instigation of the devil himself, with whom he had much conference, as that book affirmeth, and many vile and wicked doctrines of his be there set down, together with his scurrility and railing against King Henry the Eighth, in his book written against him: all which, with many other things in that book, if they be true, as the author thereof endeavoureth to prove by a number of testimonies, and most of them out of Luther's own books, surely, Sir,

What the
Defence of the
Censure saith
of Luther.

* Matt. xxviii. 20; John xiv. 16; Matt. xvi. 18.

I think it concerneth me to be of some better faith and religion, than such as should have the original and beginning from the devil. For what concord can there be between Christ and Belial—light and darkness? Mr. Doctor said, "It is a common practice of the Papists to blaspheme the true servants of God; and I think," quoth he, "I have the answer to that book." "I would gladly," said I, "have a sight of that answer, and make some trial of the truth thereof by Luther's own works, that I might know whether those things were true or no, that are reported of him, and then I should soon be satisfied."

4. And now, it being dinner-time, Mr. Doctor said he was to dine, as I remember, with Mr. Archdeacon, and so he left me, not intending, as it seemed, to have any further conference with me, which made me conceive an hard opinion of Mr. Doctor's charity and zeal, who, perceiving in what state I was, inclining now towards Popery, which himself esteemed the worship of Antichrist, and consequently the ready way to damnation, would seem so willing as he was to withdraw himself from so good and charitable a work, especially being commended and appointed thereto by order from so supreme authority.

5. But after I parted with Doctor Downham, I met with Mr. Rolfe, the commissary, who, demanding whether Mr. D. had conferred with me, I answered, "Yes, Sir, we have had some conference." "What," saith he, "hath he satisfied you?" I answered, "Truly, no; we have had but a small conference to my purpose; but Mr. Doctor thinketh that he hath the answer to the Defence, which I greatly desire to see." So, after we had talked together a while of sundry things, Mr. Rolfe departed, wishing me in anywise to expect some further conference with Mr. Doctor; wherefore, returning toward the church, where the visitation was kept, as soon as I saw him, I went unto him, desiring him to help me to the foresaid book, which he said he would; and so walking along towards the church, we fell into speech concerning Luther, Calvin, and Beza, and after that we had much talk for the space of almost an hour concerning the church, and pastors thereof, Mr. Doctor still inveigh-

My conference
with Mr. Dr.
Downham after
dinner.

ing against the abominations of the Church of Rome, and against the Pope, calling him Antichrist, and affirming Luther to be a holy man, notwithstanding he might have his infirmities, and yet not yielding him to be the first beginner of their gospel, but that in all ages there have been some that have withstood the doctrine of the Church of Rome; and that there is greater light, and more illumination by God's Spirit in many in these days, for the understanding and delivering of the truth, than in former times, wherein the ancient fathers lived, "upon whose writings, or sayings, being men, we are not," saith he, "to ground our faith and belief," &c. Which kind of speech seemed very light and fantastical unto me, though he were a Doctor: for that by this means I thought that any thing may be rejected; any creeping heretics of former ages may be accounted the elect of God, and the fathers, that were the pillars of the true church in their days, and condemned them as heretics, may be thought as men to have erred therein, seeing nothing is to be builded upon them; yet I had no time to utter so much unto him, for that we were interrupted by certain ministers, his neighbours, that came to call him to go homeward, and so we brake off talk for that time. At our breaking off, Mr. Doctor said, "Well, Mr. Walsingham, I can say no more unto you, but wish you to take heed you forsake not the truth, and fall to worship Antichrist. I have some of Mr. Luther's works; if you come to my house, at any time, I will shew you them which I have." I answered, "I thank you, Sir, and seeing it is the chiefest business I come for, if it please you, I will go home with you at this present, for I know not when to have a fitter time." So I went home with Dr. Downham, and one or two ministers more.

6. And now, being come to his house at Munden, presently Mr. Doctor went into his study to seek for the answer to the "Defence of the Censure," which at length he brought unto me, and, among other books, Dr. Fulke's Rejoinder to Martiall's Reply, whereunto was annexed in the end, *A Defence of the Writings of William Fulke against the Quarrels of the Papists*. And so we walked into his garden with this Answer in his hand, wherein he

began to read some part concerning the defence of Luther, and the rest, which consisted of nothing but bitter terms against the Papists, and especially against the author of the Defence, which he esteemed to be Persons. And I, excepting somewhat against that which he spake out of the book, desired to hear some confutation of those reports, which the "Defence of the Censure" made of Luther, and some defence of his doctrines, and justifying Mr. Charke's honest dealing in citing Luther's words; but Mr. Doctor, as not willing to treat much of that, which was my only desire, slipt over into some other discourses concerning his own book, which he had dedicated to the King, wherein he said, he had proved the Pope to be Antichrist so substantially, "as that I think," quoth he, "it is sufficient to overthrow the Pope, and all the Papists' religion." So he called unto him a little youth, that was both his curate and schoolmaster for his little children—for he had a wife and divers children—to bring him that book of his. "But," I said, "it needed not, Sir; I would first see some of Luther's works, for that is the principal cause of my coming, to try what is truly to be found there; and as for the argument of your book concerning Antichrist, I can assure you Dr. Downham's book about Antichrist. that I have talked with divers learned men of our religion in England, that hold the Pope not to be Antichrist." "It is no matter for that," saith he; "if you will read my book, you shall see what proofs and arguments I allege for that I say;" with other speeches to that end. And so we passed to supper, which being ended, Mr. Doctor, turning over his books, I mean the answer to the Defence, and his own, I still desired to see some of Luther's works, and asked if he had that "*de Captivitate Babylonica*:" so he fetched it, and then I began to seek for certain places which I had noted out of the Defence, whereof some I could not find, as not being in that tome, but concerning the modest and uncivil terms of his writing against King Henry, I partly found those cited by the Defence in his Preface to the Earl of Passune, and being interrupted with other talk of Mr. Doctor, who was turning over other books, wherein he intended to shew me some excellent thing of

Luther, and contrary, some notable ill doctrine of the Papists, I was not very desirous to seek further, accounting that a sufficient testimony of the truth of the rest, albeit as the Defence affirmeth by the testimony of Gesner, a Protestant, that the book which Luther wrote against King Henry in Latin was nothing like, for immo-desty, to the same he wrote in Dutch.

7. Moreover I found in *assertionibus*, where Luther reprehendeth the Pope, as the Defence said, for defining, besides Scripture, that the soul is immortal; I found also this assertion in him, that neither man nor angel on earth can lay any one law upon any one Christian, further than he will himself. Also these words: *Ita vides, &c.* So thou seest how rich a Christian man is who cannot lease his salvation though he would with never so great sins, except he will not believe: for no sins can damn him, but only incredulity, both in "Capt. Babyl." *tit. de Baptismo*. Which words, with the rest, Mr. Doctor endeavoured to justify with certain glosses, highly extolling that excellent work of Luther upon the epistle to the Galatians,* and upon the epistles of St. Peter, adding, that that upon the Galatians was a most comfortable book, *exhorting to good works, &c.* Whereto I replied, "But, Mr. Dr. Covell reprehendeth Luther's writing upon the Galatians, saying, 'that he was not unjustly called in question by the Church of Rome for speaking harshly,' as he saith, 'concerning good works,' when he writeth thus: *Fides et sine et ante charitatem justificat*, in 2 ad Galat.† *Et fides, nisi sit sine ullis etiam minimis operibus, non justificat, imo non est fides.* "Faith without and before we have charity doth justify." And again: "Faith, unless it be without even the least good works, doth not justify, nay, it is not faith." But Mr. Doctor would scarce believe this to be so in Luther, saying, "Tush! Dr. Covell is but a young man;" signifying thereby there was but little to be ascribed unto him, though both of them had written books, and not more difference perhaps of age between them than some half-dozen years. Then I desired we might try the place,

* Dr. Covell, in his defence of Mr. Hooker, art. 6, Of Faith and Works.

† Luth. in 2 ad Galat. tom. i. prop. 3.

but then he said, he had not "Luther upon the Galatians," or else he would not let me see it. Then I mentioned that of Luther, where he saith,* *It is a false opinion, and to be abolished, that there are four gospels, for the Gospel of St. John is the only fair, true, and principal gospel;* which Mr. Doctor seemed not to believe that it was in Luther: yet because I told him how Mr. Charke and Mr. Hanmer had confessed it, he made such answer as Mr. Charke before made to the Censure, to wit, that Luther's meaning was, that all the four gospels were but one gospel. But I replied, "He could have no good meaning in making such comparisons and proposing such disparity among the four Evangelists, as when he said, *the Epistles of Paul and Peter do far pass the three Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.* What passing or pre-excelling is there?" said I; "were they not all penned by the Spirit of God?" It seemed to me a scandalous and dangerous kind of speaking, and therefore it is very like to be true which the Defence affirmeth by the testimony of Alasco, a Calvinist, that the same Confession of Augsburg, made by Luther and Melancthon, was accounted as a gospel by the German Protestants, yea, preferred before the epistles of Paul.†

8. Here Mr. Doctor interrupted me with some speech concerning the learned of Germany, which I remember not, but I proceeded, saying, that "Luther seemed to have had a greater estimation of himself, and his own writings, than he had due reverence to the Evangelists, as appeared by that which I have read with mine own eyes," quoth I, "in his Preface to his exposition of the first Epistle of St. Peter, translated into English: you shall hear," and then I read out of my note-book as followeth:‡ *Thou readest, said Luther, nothing written by any of the apostles, which is not also contained in the writings of others, as it were, penners of the Scripture; but they that have handled this point especially, and with greater endeavour and study than the rest, namely, that only faith in Christ*

* Defence, p. 45.

† Alas. in Epist. ad Regem Poloniæ in harmon. Confess. Augustanæ.

‡ Luther, in his preface before his expositions upon the 1st of Peter.

doth justify, even they are the best Evangelists of all. Hereupon you may more rightly call the Epistles of Paul the gospel than those things which Matthew and Mark and Luke have written. So he. And this book I did see, in English, at the stationer's shop, next to the north door of Paul's church, and there I presently copied out his words *verbatim*. And again, in the same place, he further saith: *This epistle of St. Peter is to be accounted among the most excellent books of the New Testament, and is the true and pure gospel.* And there also, speaking of judging and discerning of true Scripture, and such like things there mentioned,* he saith: *This power to judge have all Christians, and not the Pope or councils alone:* so that by his saying, every man, learned or unlearned, if he be a Christian, may judge which is right and which is wrong Scripture, and so follow and believe what he think best. To this Mr. Doctor made little or no answer, but highly commended Luther, saying he was a holy man, and his works were many and learned, and full of great comfort, and that he had received great consolation by them, especially by that upon the Epistle to the Galatians, with such like speeches. And thus, having spent a good part of the night, he drew to an end, and then, after Mr. Doctor had made a long extemporal prayer, without book, perhaps well near for the space of half an hour, his wife and household being also present, I was directed to my lodging.

9. The next day morning I prepared myself to take my leave of Mr. Doctor and his wife; but in the mean while it chanced another minister came to visit him, being a man somewhat aged and grave, whom Mr. Doctor made acquainted with the occasion of my coming unto him;

At conference
with an elder
minister.

who thereupon desired to have some conference with me; so we walked together with Mr. Doctor into his garden, where, relating unto him (according to his request) such motives, rehearsed before, which caused my doubts, the said elder minister began to speak of the obstinacy of Papists, in that they would not hear the truth manifested unto them. And besides, he accused the Papists of false reports, and

* Luther, in his preface before his expositions upon the 1st of Peter.

untrue dealing in their writings, &c. I said, "Why, this is that I would fain see: if I could see this book proved false in his reports, I could tell somewhat to say; but as far as I have made trial, I find him to write no untruth." Then he began to tell us how himself had been lately sent for to talk with a Papist, being in prison, as I think, in Hertford gaol; "But when I came," saith he, "he would not hear me speak, saying, 'You have no authority to teach, neither do I acknowledge you for lawful pastor,' &c. Whereunto I answered," saith he, "Why, I am a minister well known in the country; I have been a preacher these (*so many*) years; I am known in the country sufficiently what I am; I have taken the degrees of schools; I am a Master of Art, and I have preached in the university, and at the visitation, before all the learned men in the country;" but for all this, as he said, the Catholic would not abide to hear him preach or dispute there, nor would so much as hear his voice. And after some such other frivolous talk, we were requested to breakfast; where, among other speeches against the Papists and their doctrine, Mr. Doctor exclaimed against *indulgences*; and thereupon calling for this answer to the Defence, read out of the same a great deal, which that same author (whom I take to be Mr. Charke, though he put not thereto his name) had huddled together, concerning *indulgences*; upon which both Mr. Doctor and the other minister made very large commentaries. Whereunto I replied very little, but that I would leave that, and many other things which the Catholics teach (for that word I then began to use with them), in suspense, until I heard what some learned man of that side could say concerning them; for that, hitherto, I had not conferred with any; granting unto them that there may be many things among them which, as yet, I did not believe, nor should very suddenly be persuaded unto.

10. And thus, breakfast ended, I desired Mr. Doctor to lend me the answer to the Defence, which he did, with Dr. Fulke against Martiall's Reply; which two only I was willing to borrow of him, albeit he would have persuaded me to have taken his own book of Antichrist with me, as

being only sufficient, as he said, to put me out of all doubts. And divers other such like treatises he would have lent unto me; but I, considering that I had work enough to peruse Mr. Bell's other book before the time appointed of my return to my Lord of Canterbury, and persuading myself I should find little good matter in any of those authors to my purpose, with those only two I took my leave of Mr. Doctor and the other minister, and so returned homeward.

11. And now by the way I began to think upon all that had passed between Mr. Doctor and myself, with the whole manner of my proceeding; and setting on the one side all the motives, reasons, and inducements which might move me to become a Papist and to think well of their religion, on the other side I began to examine my mind and conscience, what I could now say to the contrary. Again I expostulated with myself why I should now forsake my former faith and religion, being therein born and brought up; wherein, also, many men of great learning continued; with many such like thoughts and contrary cogitations, until I found myself to be as a man bereft of all his weapons, not able to defend himself any longer, having little or nothing to say, but to think thus with myself: There are many strange doctrines which the Papists hold; and yet, again, it may be I do not know their doctrines aright, nor how, or in what manner, they are able to defend and maintain such opinions as they hold. If I might once speak with some learned Papist or other, I should know further; and upon what grounds they build their worship of images, prayer to saints, praying for the dead, and their belief of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the holy communion, with other such like doctrines which they teach. But what then, said I, shall I ever become a Papist? Surely I cannot tell what to say; but methinks that would be a very strange alteration with me. And so admiring myself, and that strange alteration which began to be in me, like unto the strong current of a swift running river suddenly turned backward, committing and commending myself unto Almighty God, and resigning myself wholly unto the direc-

tion of his Holy Spirit, at last resolved fully with myself neither to turn to the right hand nor to the left, by mine own will, which, peradventure, might be drawn to the one or to the other, by fear of trouble, affection of friends, or hope of preferment, with other temporal inducements; but intended to put on as indifferent a mind as possibly I could towards both Catholic and Protestant religion, to the end that, weighing and considering, with most diligent and serious ponderation and advisement, the force and strength of such arguments and inducements as should either move me to follow the one or neglect the other, I might resolutely embrace that faith, and constantly profess that religion, which Almighty God should propose unto me, for the only true way to eternal life. [For I oftentimes thought with myself that Almighty God, the Father of mercy, who will, as the apostle saith, all men to be saved, would not permit any man to perish in the by-paths of damnable heresy, who, with all indifferency towards the things of this life, either to retain or forsake them for his honour, and with an entire resignation of all the faculties of his soul, to be informed or reformed by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit alone (where other ordinary means were wanting, as to me at that present), should humbly pray and instantly solicit the divine goodness with those words of the prophet: *Revela oculos meos*: "Take from mine eyes the veil of ignorance, and I will consider and ponder the wonderful things of thy law." And, "Give me understanding, and I will search into thy law; I will keep the same with my whole heart," &c. Wherefore I often made recourse unto the throne of grace by prayer, saying] these words and the like, which I often reiterated:—

12. O Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of all mankind, who invitest all that labour and are heavy laden with the burden of their sins to come unto thee, promising unto them that they shall find rest unto their souls; refresh my wearied soul, enlighten me with the knowledge of thy truth. Thou art the way, the truth, and the life; teach me, then, Lord, thy ways, and direct me in thy paths. Thou wouldest not the death

My perplexity,
and petition to
Almighty
God.

of a sinner, but rather that he turn from his wicked ways and live. Turn thou me, O Lord, unto thee, and then shall I be truly converted. My heart is ready, O Lord, my heart is ready, with what simplicity and singleness of mind, thou best knowest; I know it not. Create in me, O my God, a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me. Give me the comfort of thy saving health, and confirm and strengthen me in the same by thy Holy Spirit; then shall I teach sinners thy ways, and the ungodly shall be converted unto thee. O Lord, open thou my lips, and my mouth shall shew forth thy praise. Lord, hear my prayer, and let my cry come unto thee.

CHAPTER VII.

What I did when I came home from the Conference with Mr. Dr. Downham; and how first I took in hand to confer Mr. Charke's Reply with the "Defence of the Censure;" and what I found therein.

AND NOW, being in this good disposition to hear what God would say unto me in my heart, I thought best to open unto him my care, and to look over diligently again with attention and the best indifferency I could, that book which before had so much moved me; to wit, the "Defence of the Censure," together with the answer or Reply made thereunto by Mr. Charke,* as I supposed, though he put not thereunto his name. The book was of a good bulk, in quarto, the leaves gilded, the print fair, the binding curious, the argument and subject much desired and thirsted by me; all which, you may imagine, incensed me to read with appetite, hoping to find thereby full satisfaction to all my doubts, and quietness to my afflicted conscience.

2. But when I came to view and peruse the same, binding to compare this answer leaf by leaf with the "Defence of the Censure," and finding it to be without name of author, having only a most bitter insinuation, I began first to marvel at that; because I did see no reason why any Protestant writer should conceal his name in so worthy a matter as the defence of his religion, and especially a confutation of this book, which did so nearly touch the honour, credit, estimation, yea, life and death, as to me it seemed, of our Protestant religion; and for which his labour and learned

Mr. Charke
putteth not his
name to this
book.

* Some think Dr. Fulke, which is not unlikely, in regard of intemperate railing.

travail, he might assuredly hope for so great praise and commendation, not only of men, but reward from God also, whose truth and gospel he should acquit from such and so great blemishes of falsehood and untruth as were by the adversaries thereof (the Papists) objected against it. But yet I bethought myself, that neither this other book of the Papists' party had the name of any author annexed unto it, and therefore it was less material; though, again, I could not but confess that the Papist that wrote the Defence had far greater reason to conceal his name, in regard of the danger of his person, of which Mr. Charke needed not to stand in any doubt or fear, but rather to expect honour and credit for the same, if he answered well and learnedly. And besides, it was written principally in his own defence, which seemed to require the setting down of his own name.

3. Well, concerning this scruple I stood not much upon it, but resolved, with the greatest indifferency I could possibly put on, to weigh and consider the arguments and proofs brought on either party, concerning the affirmation or negation, truth or falsehood, of those important and weighty matters, as they seemed to me, contained in the "Defence of the Censure," and not greatly to care who was the author of the one or of the other, but what each man said, and with what proof, ground, or reason.

4. Wherefore, beginning to compare the points before mentioned of my chiefest doubts, to see what Mr. Charke would answer unto them, I found very little or nothing that, in reason, could give me any contentment; for I saw, in effect, nothing but a hot, choleric invective against the author of the Defence, telling him first, and facing him down, that the cause why there was no public disputation was in him and his fellows, as being afraid to come to that trial, whatsoever they said; and that, in all occasions where any conference had been, they had remained with the worst. Which kind of answer contented me not; for that I expected he would have said, that disputation should be procured, and that he and the rest of our clergy would join in that suit to her majesty that then was. Secondly, to

The small satisfaction & received by Mr. Charke's Reply.

all the ways set down in particular by the Defence, for trying of a Catholic and heretical spirit, he said little or nothing; but only that he and his would be tried by the Scriptures, which now seemed to me an endless matter, seeing that presently the controversy would be about the sense and interpretation of Scripture.

5. Thirdly, to that of Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Beza, their lives and doctrines, which principally I desired to see discussed, he seemed to me to answer scarce any thing to the purpose, but ran into a great exclamation of Popish slanderers, and against the absurdities of divers points of Popish doctrine; as *indulgences*, and the like, which were not now in question; and therefore all that speech seemed to me a superfluous digression, and wholly from the purpose; for I would have had him examined the place out of Luther's own writings about himself and others, both for life and doctrine. But this was not done; only in general he would seem to excuse matters, or rather to divert the reader from attention unto them with a certain flourish of words, whereof, for example, I thought good to set down these that follow. "As for Berengarius," saith he, "Huss, Wickliff, Luther, &c., we measure them according to those times wherein the Lord stirred them up, and according to the measure of grace and light that he bestowed upon them; and, whatsoever were their imperfections, therein we do not justify them, but give God the praise of his work, and leave them in their place as men: yet we may and will thus far defend them against that doggish tooth of yours, that in the principal points of faith, whereupon dependeth salvation, they were sound with Athanasius and all other holy men of God."

Mr. Charke's manner of answering in defence of Luther and others.

6. This was his answer in general, and containing the very sum of his defence in that behalf; which, for that cause, I read over again and again, and gathered the same into my note-book, pondering every word and sentence thereof, but found myself therewith less satisfied than before; for it seemed to me plain, by these his words, that he had no certainty of any thing, or rule with whom to join, or with whom not, in matters of

faith and religion; but only if in any point they hold against the Papists, it seemed sufficient to Mr. Charke to make them holy men and our brethren in religion. And I considered with myself what heretics, schismatics, or never so wicked men might be in the world of former times, of whom we might not say this which Mr. Charke saith here, if in any article they agreed with us, as every one did in some, and the very Turk doth at this day in many; to wit, we may say of them, as Mr. Charke saith here of Berengarius, Huss, Wickliff, and Luther, that we measure them according to those times wherein the Lord stirred them up, and according to the measure of grace and light which he bestowed upon them; and, whatsoever were their imperfections (*as, for example, heresies, schisms, apostasies, wicked life, or the like*), that therein we do not justify them, and yet we admit them for brethren, and holy men, and chosen members of our church.

7. Were not this a good excuse? thought I with myself. And might not he have a goodly church with such companions and fraternity? But yet I began to think more seriously with myself what he meant when he saith that Berengarius, Huss, Wickliff, and Luther, in the principal points of faith, whereupon dependeth salvation, were sound with Athanasius and all other holy men of God. And for that I had read one point here, touched divers times before, both in Mr. Charke, Mr. Fulke, and others,

Whether
Wickliff,
Huss, and Lu-
ther could be
members of our
church.

where they do hold Lutherans, and some other sectaries that expressly hold us for heretics, to be true brethren of our church; for that, as they say, they agreed with us in the principal points of faith, whereupon dependeth salvation; I began to ponder earnestly what were these points which they call the principal, whereon dependeth salvation, and whether there were any certain rule to know them, or no; or whether every man might admit, or reject, men into or from the church, according to his own judgment. And here I confess I could find no ground; for that Luther and all Lutherans do affirm in their books, even unto this day, that we Protestants of England are damned heretics, for denying the *real presence*. And, on the contrary, we

say that they are good Protestants, and holy men, and our brethren, though they hold and defend the *real presence*, which we deny and condemn for idolatry. So as in this point I was wonderfully perplexed, and could find no way to get out.

8. Then I went to look out the several opinions and positions of Berengarius, Huss, Wickliff, and Luther, to see wherein they agreed, and differed from us, and among themselves. And for the first, I find that Berengarius agreed in all points of doctrine with the Papists, saving only about the *real presence*, which yet he recanted also twice afterwards publicly, as all histories write, and consequently he could not agree or be sound with Athanasius, and with all other holy men of God, as Mr. Charke here saith, "if they agree with us Protestants in religion;" and, secondly, I found that Huss, Wickliff, and Luther did partly agree, and partly dissent in many important articles of belief, both with us and amongst themselves. So as they can never, thought I, be well said to have been sound with us, except with soundness we admit wounds and ulcers in points of faith, which seemed unto me very unsound doctrine, and no ways to be admitted, whether we respect either the honour of our church, or the security of our salvation: and I took this to be but a very shift in Mr. Charke, and his like, to rid themselves of that which otherwise they cannot answer.

Men with unsound opinions cannot be admitted into a sound church.

9. To all the rest of my difficulties I found in effect no substantial answer at all. For when he should defend and justify Luther's doctrines before recited, he falleth into a rage against many Catholic doctrines, as before I have said, as that of *indulgences* and *pardons*, whereof his adversary in the Defence made no mention at all; and as for the doctrine of *traditions*, which was another difficulty of mine, for their discredit he allegeth divers fond traditions, letting pass those for the most part, which the Censure, and the Defence thereof, did recite, as held for apostolical by the consent of ancient fathers, from age to age, as the baptizing of infants, observation of the Lent, and divers others. So as, indeed, this answer of his seemed nothing else but

a shifting off, and a desire of revenging himself upon his adversary by acrimony and acerbity of speech, which to me seemed little satisfaction; and so I left the matter, and passed over to read Mr. Bell's other book, according to the band of my oath and promise, as before you have heard.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the perusal of Mr. Bell's Second Book, entitled the "Survey of Popery;" and what satisfaction it gave me.

ALBEIT, as before I have told thee, gentle reader, I was greatly wearied with the loathsome reading over of so many foul narrations, as Mr. Bell had laid forth in his former volume of the "Anatomy," especially misdoubting with myself of the man's fidelity in relating many of them, which seemed that they must needs be either feigned, amplified, or much exaggerated, and thereby I had less appetite to return to the perusing of any more of his works: yet remembering my oath and promise to my Lord of Canterbury, and hoping also that in his second volume, entitled "A Survey of Popery, or Popish Doctrine," I should find more coherence between the subject and the title of the book, than I had in the former, and more cleanly and sober matter handled therein, I began to peruse the parts and parcels thereof, which was divided into divers books, as the other of the "Anatomy," though not with any great method or fit order, but rather confusedly, containing a *chaos* of sundry heads in religion; as, namely, in his first book, he treateth of the beginning and proceeding in religion, even from Adam, as also of the Turks' religion from Mahomet, and some such other points which now I remember not, neither have I the book by me.

2. But yet reading over all for avoiding of scruple, though I had no time nor commodity of books to examine all, I thought it needful to collect some few points here and there, to shew afterward unto my Lord of Canterbury, whereby his lordship might see that I had not passed over

The examination of Mr. Bell's answering in his Survey.

all so slightly, but that I had made some reflection thereon, both for my own instruction, and his grace's better information. And so pretermittin many things which seemed to me very doubtful, and worthy of examination if fit occasion and leisure had permitted, I fell first to examine his answer to one certain objection of many, framed by himself in the name of the Papists, his adversaries, about the church, which he promiseth to answer fully, and with all sincerity, without adding, taking away, or diminishing any thing that might make for them or their cause, which gave me good hope to find it so, though afterward I found, indeed, that I was deceived, as presently will appear.

3. First then, omitting many other, in the third part of his Survey and second chapter, he reciteth divers arguments and replies of the Papists concerning the church.

The Catholics' argument that once had prevailed with Mr. Bell. The third reply is this: "The church of God," say they, "cannot be without bishops and priests, as you have already granted, and as is proved out of St. Paul, Ephes. iv. 11; but so it is, when the Protestants first reformed the church, as you term it, ye neither had any bishops nor any priests of your own, neither could you find any but with us and in our church, when Martin Luther went out from us: our church, therefore, and none but ours, is the true church of God. This reason is so strong, as it can never be truly answered."

4. This argument allegeth Mr. Bell in name of the Papists,* and then answereth the same thus: "I say first," quoth he, "that this reason seemeth to carry a majesty with it, and a very plausible show of truth, and therefore did it a long time fascinate and seduce myself; yet I trust, by God's holy assistance, so to solve it as no Papist shall have cause any longer therein to glory. I say, secondly, that if our bishops or lay brethren had gone at any time to the Greek and east churches, they should have found as good a material succession at the least, as that of yours at Rome, but there was no need to take so long and so painful a journey in hand. I say, thirdly, that our bishops and priests of late

Mr. Bell's triple answer.

* Survey, fol. 208.

us were indeed consecrated by such as were sometimes your church, but thereupon it will not follow, I assure you, that the true church of God was with you and not with us. For no more can be inferred upon your reason, that there remained a certain external face of the visible church still with you, that is to say, a mingled material succession of place and persons, without the formal legal succession of truth and doctrine."

This is his answer, which to me did not give any satisfaction. For as for the first two points, that it moved itself for divers years to be a Papist, and that in the Greek Church there is the like material succession as in the Roman, seemed rather to make against him, than for him. For his being a Papist, as he saith, so many years upon the force of this argument, seemed to me should bind him to be the same, except he could bring a stronger argument to the contrary, or at leastwise some better reason than this trifling toy about the Greek Church. And, indeed, I was angry to hear him bring forth so weak and fond satisfaction, after so large a promise. For as for the Greek Church and her succession, it helpeth not Mr. Bell's part anything at all in this behalf: for neither he nor his could join with the Greek Church in her succession, nor shew any such like in our Protestant Church, as the Greeks had or have in theirs; with whom neither do Protestants agree in substantial points of religion, more than the Romans.

And as for his third answer, that the Papists have material succession only of bishops and priests from Christ and his apostles downward, and not the formal or actual of true doctrine, [methought the Papists would say that this was only *petitio principii*, as they speak in schools, which is to take that as granted which is still in controversy; and further, it appeared to me, that this answer was] very prejudicial to all our vocations of the Protestant ministry, forsomuch as if it be granted that the Papists have a true and lawful material succession and continuation of their clergy, then doth it follow also, and must needs be inferred, that they have in like

manner the formal, seeing Christ said to his disciples,* and in them to their successors, visible bishops and pastors, that he would be with them to the world's end, and that the Holy Ghost should suggest unto them all truth: and I remembered to have read in very ancient fathers,† Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Augustine, that they did prove the truth of their religion against heretics in their days, by the external and material succession of bishops from Christ downward in the Catholic Church; so as the material true succession of lawful bishops and priests, being once granted, the formal of true doctrine, if Christ keep his promise, must needs follow; and, consequently, Mr. Bell, in this, did not give me satisfaction, but rather did put much more doubt and scruple in me, making me to think, that if I had been in his case, I should have been afraid to have made so great a change upon so slender a ground, as to me it seemed he had done.

7. Wherefore to leave this subject, I passed over to another article handled more largely than any of the rest, concerning priests' marriages, for that perhaps it concerned him nearest, wherein, after his protestations of sincere dealing, as before, he promises to allege for the lawfulness of such marriages most plain places and testimonies of fathers, doctors, yea, and Papists schoolmen also; but I had time only to examine some few, whereby I might easily see what was to be expected of the rest. He alleged, therefore, a place of St.

Chrysostom, wherein, he saith, are these *golden words*, and for that they were *golden*, I was tempted to look upon them with more diligence, and to examine them in the author himself. The words of St. Chrysostom are these, writing upon those words of St. Paul to Titus: *that a bishop must be faultless, and the husband of one wife.*

8. *Obstruere prorsus intendit*, saith he, *hæreticorum ora, qui nuptias damnant, ostendens eam rem culpa carere, imo*

How insuf-
ficient Mr.
Bell's answer
seemed to me.

Mr. Bell's
golden sen-
tence out of St.
Chrysostom.

* Matt. xxviii.; John xvi.

† Iren. advers. Hæres. lib. 3, c. 3; Tertul. L. de Præscriptione adv. Hær.; Aug. L. de Utilitate Credendi, cap. 17.

pretiosam esse, ut cum ipsa etiam possit quispiam ad actum episcopatus solum subvehi. Which Mr. Bell mislateth thus: * "The apostle intendeth to confound the heretics that condemn marriage, declaring that it is faultless, and a thing so precious, as a man may with it be promoted to the holy function of a bishop." And then he saith: *Thus saith St. Chrysostom,† whose words are so plain and pithy, as no Papist is able to wrest and writhe to serve his turn.* And then, hereupon he maketh his objections, as he calleth them; and so urgeth these words *cum ipsa*, being of the feminine gender, as if *ipsa* in this place had meant a woman, or the necessary use thereof; whereas it signifieth (*rem*) the state of marriage itself, which may be in a bishop, according to St. Chrysostom, without conjugal act or conversation. But, in this Mr. Bell concludeth thus: *I therefore conclude, saith St. Chrysostom, that if St. Chrysostom meant not of a bishop's marriage, that he may marry during the very time he is a bishop, his argument is vain and frivolous.* And therefore he crieth out in his margin, *Answer, O ye seminary boys, or else recant your doctrine.* Thus he, making St. Chrysostom to be clear on his side in this point, and not inclining to favour the Papists' part, unless they will leave him to speak vainly, and nothing to the purpose he hath in hand.

But I, going to St. Chrysostom, in the same place where Mr. Bell citeth, I found him to write thus upon the said words: † *Si quis, inquit apostolus, est sine crimine, sine uxoris, vir, &c. Cujus rei gratia hujusmodi homines ad episcopatum adducit? Obstruere prorsus intendit, &c.* If he saith the apostle, be faultless, the husband of one woman, &c., why, saith St. Chrysostom, doth he make mention of these sorts of men? Whereto he answereth: *The apostle intendeth to confound the heretics that condemn marriage, declaring that it is faultless, and a thing*

survey, fol. 218.

† Chrys. Hom. 2, in Tit. ii.

Τίνος ἕνεκεν καὶ τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰς μέσον παράγει; ἐπιστομίζει τοὺς τοὺς τὸν γάμον διαβάλλοντας, δεικνὺς ὅτι τὸ πρᾶγμα οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡμιτελές, ἀλλ' οὕτως τίμιον, ὥς μετ' αὐτοῦ δύνασθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἄγιον ἀναθρόνον, ἐν ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀσελεγεῖς κολάζων, καὶ οὐκ ἀφίξει μετὰ οὐ γάμον τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγχειρίζεσθαι ταύτην.]

so precious, that even with it (*that is, though he were married before*), a man may be promoted to the dignity of a bishop." And immediately it followeth: *Castigat hoc etiam impudicos, dum non eos permittit post secundas nuptias ad ecclesiæ regimen, dignitatemque pastoris assumi.* Hereby also the apostle chasteneth (or rebuketh) the unchaste persons, whilst he permitteth them not, after their second marriage, to be chosen unto the government of the church, and dignity of a pastor.

Two abuses
offered to St.
Chrysostom
by Mr. Bell.

10. So here I noted two misconstructions of St. Chrysostom in this one allegation of Mr. Bell; the first, that whereas the holy father doth say, that a married man might be made a bishop in those days, he inferreth that a bishop, after his ordination, may marry; which St. Chrysostom saith not, but rather teacheth the contrary doctrine, both in this place and in divers others, as I found by search; and namely, Hom. 2, *de patientia Job*; and Hom. 10, in 1 *Tim.*, and elsewhere. The second abuse is, that whereas St. Chrysostom, in the very next words after, doth affirm that he that hath been twice married, [albeit he have no wife at all then living,] cannot be made a bishop, nor have any dignity ecclesiastical in the church, Mr. Bell leaveth that quite out, as not making to his purpose; so, as I saw, there was not here that sincerity which before he promised.

11. More than this, he allegeth,* for the lawfulness of priests to marry after they are priests, the story of Paphnutius, in the first Council of Nice, who, seeing the council inclined to make a decree that priests married before their priesthood might not have use of their wives afterward, proposed the danger of incontinency both in themselves and in their wives. Whereupon that decree proceeded not; but yet he affirmed, that to such as were made priests before they were married, it was not lawful to marry after; *which, he said, was conform unto the ancient tradition and custom of the church*, as the words both of Socrates and Sozomenus do testify, who are the only writers of this story. But now Mr. Bell foundeth upon this fact of Paphnutius, that both priests might marry in those days,

* Survey, f. 233.

after they were priests, and use their wives also; accusing the Pope's doctrine for doctrine of devils, as teaching the contrary; whereas I found that Paphnutius expressly denied that it was lawful for priests to marry after they were priests, and saith that this was, in his time, the ancient tradition and custom of the church, *ut qui cælibes fuissent gradum sacerdotalem adepti, postea minimè uxores ducerent*—that such as, being single or unmarried men, had attained the degree of priesthood, should in nowise afterward marry. So as herein also I found Mr. Bell not to deal truly and uprightly.

Another abuse
offered to
Paphnutius.

12. Not much after this again he allegeth a place out of St. Augustine for allowing of priests' marriages;* and he setteth the same forth with this protestation: *St. Augustine, saith he, hath such a plain declaration of his mind in this point, as whosoever shall once read or hear his words cannot but perceive the same. Thus doth he write expressly—I will not alter or change one word:—Postremò damnantur tales, non quia conjugalem fidem posteriùs inierunt, sed quia continentiae primam fidem irritam fecerunt; quod ut breviter insinualet apostolus, noluit eas dicere habere damnationem quæ post amplioris sanctitatis propositum nubunt, non quia non damnentur, sed ne in eis ipsæ nuptiæ damnari putarentur. Et infra: Proinde qui dicunt talium nuptias non esse nuptias, sed potius adulteria, non mihi videntur satis acutè ac diligenter considerare quid dicant.*† Which Mr. Bell englisheth thus: "In fine, such are damned, not because they are afterwards married, but because they have made void the first promise of chastity; which thing the apostle, intending briefly to insinuate, would not say that they were damned who marry after the purpose of larger sanctimony; not because they are not damned, but lest he should ‡ seem to condemn their marriages in them: therefore they that say the marriages of such are no marriages, but adulteries, seemed to me not to consider exactly what they say." "By which words of St. Augustine," saith Mr. Bell, "it is clear, that he is so far from condemning the matrimonies of votive widows which cannot live conti-

* Survey, fol. 243.

† Aug. de Bono Viduitat. c. 9, 10, tom. iv.

‡ Corrupt translation; vide *infra*, Nu. 14.

nently, as he reputeth them for perfect, true, and lawful marriages." Thus far Mr. Bell relateth and expoundeth St. Augustine.

St. Augustine
misalleged for
the allowing of
marriages of
votaries.

13. But when I went to examine the place itself in St. Augustine, I did blush to see his great abuse in this behalf. For that St. Augustine is so far from allowing the act of marriage in *votaries*, either men or women, for lawful, after their vows, as he holdeth that it is damnable to have but a will and purpose only thereof, though they never put the same in execution; albeit, if they do put it in execution, and marry before their said vow be solemnly made and publicly received by the church, the fact is damnable sin, but the marriages do hold; nor are they to be called adulteries, though, according to St. Augustine, in the nature and guilt of sin, they are worse than adulteries; for that the obligation of marriage doth hold, though contracted in sin and with sin, after any firm purpose or simple vow made to God of virginity, chastity, or single life. For better understanding whereof, I shall set down the whole place as it is in St. Augustine, in his book *de Bono Viduitatis*, c. 9, 10, and 11.

14. St. Augustine having discoursed largely of the excellency of *continency* and single life in that place, and of the invitations and large promises of reward made thereunto in Scripture, writeth thus: "*Sed quoniam, sicut ait Dominus, non omnes capiunt verbum hoc, quæ potest capere, capiat, quæ se non continet, nubat, quæ non cæpit, deliberet, quæ aggressa est, perseveret, &c.*" But for that, as Christ saith, all receive not this word (to wit, the exhortation to continency), the widow or virgin that is capable of it, let her apprehend it; she that findeth herself not able to contain, let her marry; she that hath not yet begun to think of it, let her deliberate what is best to do; she that hath begun to follow that life, let her persevere: let no occasion be given to the adversary, let no oblation be subtracted (or drawn back) from Christ. In conjugal life, if honesty of marriage bed be conserved and kept, there is no damnation feared; but in the continent life of widows and virgins the excellency of a

St. Augustine's
discourse
about continency.

more high * estate is aspired unto; which excellency being once aspired unto and chosen, offered up to God by obligation of vow, it is damnable, not only to take in hand marriage, but also to have a will to marry, though marriage itself doth not ensue. And to demonstrate this, the apostle unto Timothy, said not, that such women, after they had lived wantonly in Christ, did marry, but that they had a will to marry, *habentes, inquit, damnationem, quoniam primam fidem irritam fecerunt, et si non nubendo, sed tamen volendo*, they having, saith he, 'incurred damnation, for that they have made void their first faith, or promise, though not by marrying, actually, but by having a will to marry;' not for that marriage itself, even in such people is to be condemned, but for that the sliding from their purpose is damned: the breaking also of the faith of their vow is damned, not their taking up of an inferior good thing, but their falling from a higher good thing is damned in them. And, finally, such persons are damned, not for that they gave their faith afterwards to wedlock, but for that they did break their first faith of continency; which thing, that the apostle might briefly insinuate, he would not say that such women are damned, for that they marry † after the purpose made of a greater holiness, not for that they are not damned; but, *ne in eis ipsæ nuptiæ damnari putarentur*, lest that marriage itself should be thought to be condemned in them [(not as Mr. Bell corrupteth, lest he should seem to condemn their marriages in them)]; but when he said *nubere volunt*, they will marry, presently he added, *habentes damnationem*, incurring thereby damnation. And he uttereth the cause, saying, for that they have made void their first faith, that it might appear that their will, which had fallen from an higher purpose, is damned, whether marriage do follow or no. Whereof those which do say, that marriages of such people are not marriages, but rather adulteries, do not seem to me to consider so sharply and diligently as they ought, what they say, being deceived with a certain similitude of truth," &c.

15. Hitherto is St. Augustine's discourse, brokenly set

* Amplioris muneris.

† [Who marry; habere damnationem, quæ post amplioris, &c.]

down, as you have seen, by Mr. Bell, which did very much move me to have an ill opinion of his sincerity, especially forsomuch as he left out not only most of the precedent discourse, which is very important, as you see, but also these words following, that ensue in St. Augustine, after some few lines. "Wherefore I cannot say," saith he, "that these women, which are fallen from a better purpose, if they marry, that their marriages are adulteries, and not marriages, but plainly I do not doubt to affirm, that these slidings back,* and fallings away from a more holy chastity, which is vowed to God, are worse than adulteries. For, if it cannot be doubted but that Christ is highly offended when a member of his doth not keep her faith unto her husband, how much more grievously is he offended when faith is not kept unto himself, in a thing that he did not exact to be offered unto him, but being once offered, he exacteth the performance thereof!⁵" Hitherto St. Augustine. In which words it seemeth, that he is very clear against the marriages of votaries, though he do not deny them to be marriages, if there have passed only a simple vow. And this I also understood afterward to be the common doctrine of the Roman Church, which doth disannul marriages made only after solemn vows, though not after simple. And thus much about priests' and votaries' marriages.

16. After this again, Mr. Bell coming to treat of the eucharist, or sacrament of the altar, he allegeth St. Gregory with this preamble:† "In the primitive and apostolic church," saith he, "the mass, or holy communion, was administered with the Lord's Prayer only:‡ all superstitious ceremonies set apart, for that Gregorius Magnus, whose testimony no Papist in the world can or will reject, writeth thus: *Orationem autem Dominicam, &c.*—We, therefore, after the prayer, immediately say the Lord's Prayer, because it was the custom of the apostles to consecrate the oblation with that only prayer: whereof he would infer that only the Lord's Prayer, or *Pater noster*, were to be used in the communion. Which words making me to marvel for that the Protestants themselves have

* Aug. *ibid.*

† Survey, fol. 476.

‡ Greg. l. 7. Epist. 64.

many other prayers in their communion, I went to St. Gregory, and read the epistle here quoted by Mr. Bell, which truly made me to wonder exceedingly that he would cite it. For, first, St. Gregory, writing unto the Bishop of Syracuse, in Sicily, about some, Mr. Bell's dealing with St. Gregory. either Greeks or Latins, that murmured, or were displeased at some parts of the Latin mass, comparing it with that of Constantinople: as, for example, about the saying of *Alleluia* at certain times of the year, and of *Kyrie eleison*, often repeated, and of the *Lord's Prayer*, which prayer, among the Greeks, all did pronounce in time of the sacrifice, but only clergymen among the Latins; at length, St. Gregory cometh to speak of the canon of the mass,* after which, and the consecration done, the *Lord's Prayer* hath his place, whereof St. Gregory yieldeth this reason, *Quia mos apostolorum fuit, ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent*,—for that it was the custom of the apostles to consecrate the sacrifice of oblation, accompanying it only with the Lord's Prayer: this being the use at the first, though soon after divers other prayers were added, even in the apostles' time, as appeareth by the liturgies of St. James, St. Clement, and others.

17. Here then it seemed to me, that Mr. Bell had alleged St. Gregory against himself. For whereas he saith, that in the primitive and apostolic church, according to St. Gregory, the mass, or holy communion, was administered with the *Lord's Prayer* only, I find many other things mentioned by St. Gregory, especially in solemn masses.† *In quotidianis autem Missis*, saith he, *alia quæ dici solent tacemus, tantummodo Kyrie eleison, et Christe eleison dicimus ut in his deprecationis vocibus, paulò diutius occupemur*—"In daily masses, which are not solemn, we pass over other things in silence, only we say *Kyrie eleison*, and *Christe eleison*, to the end that we may be occupied somewhat the longer in prayer." And then follow the other words cited by Mr. Bell, who seemeth much deceived in thinking that the apostles did consecrate the sacrifice of oblation with the only *Pater noster*, or Lord's

* Greg. *ibid.*

† Greg. *ubi supra.*

Many things
in St. Gre-
gory not fit to
be alleged by
Mr. Bell.

Prayer:* for that it appeareth plainly by St. Gregory's words, that that prayer was added after consecration, by tradition of Christ himself and his apostles: for *inconveniens*, saith St.

Gregory, *visum est, ut ipsam traditionem quam Redemptor noster composuit, super ejus corpus et sanguinem, tacere-mus*; "it seemed unfit that we should not rehearse over his body and blood, the tradition which our Redeemer did compose," &c. So as now the consecration was made when this prayer was to be said upon the body and blood, according to St. Gregory's words; and therefore could not be consecrated with it, or by it, as Mr. Bell would have it.

18. All which, when I had read and considered, and found masses here named, both solemn and private, consecration of the sacrifice of oblation by the apostles mentioned, as also the recital of the Lord's Prayer upon the consecrated body and blood, as a tradition of Christ and his apostles, according to St. Gregory, I marvelled much why Mr. Bell would cite him so confidently. And this bred in me many more doubts and scruples than I had before; and so persuading myself that the further I should read in this man's works the less satisfaction I should receive, I resolved not to examine many more places, but to note out these few to carry with me to my Lord of Canterbury, there to receive further satisfaction or explication of the same.

* [See Bossuet, De la Trad. sur la Communion sous une espèce, ch. xlvii.]

CHAPTER IX.

How I fell upon a third Book of Mr. Bell's writing, entitled "The Downfal of Popery;" which I perused also, but found as little satisfaction as in any other thing I had read before, in regard of the unsincere dealing discovered therein.

THE time now drawing near of Easter Term, when I was bound to repair again unto my Lord of Canterbury, I began to put myself in order for that journey; and, therefore, though I espied many other things in Mr. Bell's survey which seemed to me worthy of examination, yet the time growing short, and seeing myself somewhat weary, I gathered only into a paper the few heads before mentioned; but so it fell out that after this again there came to my hands another book of Mr. Bell's, whose inscription was "The Downfal of Popery." And for that the title was so terrible and the enterprise of such importance, I was moved to steal from myself a little time to overlook the same, and to examine also some places that seemed more pregnant for his purpose against the Papists.

2. Briefly, therefore, to give the reader a short view or *anatomy* of this work, divided into eight articles, containing eight pieces of controversies, I must confess that, after some labour taken therein, I found not the work to be answerable, either to the title or to the subject, in which point, according to my opinion, it agreeth well with his former two books of "Anatomy" and "Survey;" for as he, promising to exhibit an "Anatomy of Popish Tyranny," doth only tell us tales of fond fallings out and contentions between the archpriest, priests, Jesuits, and others, nothing appertaining to Tyranny, that was his title, and promising "A Survey of Popery," which implieth a laying open of all the *parts and parcels* of that doctrine, doth

touch, notwithstanding, very few in respect of the whole corps of controversies, and those not of the greatest moment. So here promising unto us "A Downfal (or utter subversion) of Popery," he handleth only eight articles, as I have said, and those, for the most part, containing but pieces of controversies; as, in the first, about *the Pope's temporal authority over princes* for correcting them when they do amiss; in the third, about *the Pope's power to dispense in marriages*; both which are but particular branches of divers greater controversies concerning the Pope and his authority; in the fifth, he, declining from the controversy of true merit and the effects thereof, endeavoureth to impugn *condign merit* only; and, in the seventh part, intending to treat of traditions, he leaveth those principal traditions, which are of importance to be held, or not held, and runneth to other of lesser moment. And, finally, in the eighth article, he impugneth *the ability of keeping God's commandments*, in a very strange and extravagant sense; so as these articles seeming to me, neither to be all, nor the major part, nor yet the chief pillars of

The small substance of Mr. Bell's Downfal.

Popery, as he termeth them, could not so easily work the downfal thereof, though Mr. Bell had borne himself never so manfully in the assault. But now, looking over his labours, I doubt me they will be to small effect; yet some points that seemed to me most remarkable of his defects in handling the same, I took out by the way to carry with me to London, and to inform my judgment thereby about Mr. Bell and his talent in writing, against the time I should be demanded, what I thought thereof, by my Lord of Canterbury, as I presumed I should.

3. First then, in his Epistle dedicatory to the King, he sheweth himself so impatient, or rather impotent, in that behalf, as from the very first period thereof, not respecting the majesty of his person to whom he writeth, he rageth extremely, affirming priests and Papists to be the *curst brood of traitorous Jesuits*; and then, as for Jesuits themselves, his epithetons are, *traitorous, seditious, brutish, barbarous, villanous, most bloody, treacherous, proud, tyrannical, firebrands, thieves, murderers, Machiavels, co-*

zeners, and dependents of the devil himself: which I, considering, thought with myself what he would do in the rest of his book, seeing he began in this intemperate manner in his very epistle to so great and modest a prince. And, further informing myself that he had been for divers years the Jesuits' scholar, and received from them the learning which he boasteth of, both in philosophy and divinity, and also many instructions towards good life, as some did report that would seem to know their proceedings in their public and private schools, it discredited much with me the man's judgment, that he would begin with such passionate and unseemly speeches against them, to whom he had been somewhat beholding, though now he were never so much different from them in religion.

4. Next after this, I passed to look upon his discourse, whether it would be as passionate as his preface; and presently in the seventh or eighth leaf thereof, I found this assertion of his, *That the Pope had made it sacrilege to dispute of his power*,* which seeming strange unto me, I desired to see some place quoted where that decree was to be found, but I saw none; and, passing over some three or four leaves more,† I found the quite contrary in effect avouched by himself, saying, *That Bellarmine's works were greatly allowed by the Pope*,‡ whereof I inferred, that then his former speech could not be true, for that Bellarmine doth dispute for divers books and whole chapters together of the Pope's power and authority; and, consequently, either he committeth sacrilege therein, or else there is no such decree of the Pope.

5. And yet going forward, some four or five pages further, I found Mr. Bell to urge greatly a place out of St. Augustine § against the real presence, where, talking of the communion of the apostles and of Judas, at the last supper with our Saviour, and the different effects thereof, he saith: *Illi manducabant panem, Dominum; ille panem Domini, contra Dominum*—"They (the apostles) did eat bread that was the Lord; he (to wit, Judas) eat the bread

* Downfal, p. 17.

† P. 26.

‡ Bellarmine, l. 4 et 5 de Potest. Pont. Rom.

§ Bell, p. 30; Augustine, Tract 59 in Joan. tom. ix.

of the Lord against the Lord." Out of which place Mr. Bell maketh this invincible argument, as he calleth it: Judas, in receiving the sacrament, received only bread of the Lord, and not bread that was the Lord; and therefore in the eucharist is not the Lord really, but only and barely the bread of the Lord. And he relieth so much upon this argument, that he protesteth plainly, *that if it can be fully answered he will subscribe again to Papists' opinions, and never more write against any part of Papists' doctrine.* Whereat I marvelled greatly, and that for sundry reasons. First, that he would adventure the renegation of the Protestant religion upon the solution of one place or argument out of one only doctor; and, secondly, for that the very opposite conclusion to his may be made, as it seemeth to me, out of the alleged words of St. Augustine, to wit, that forsomuch as he affirmeth the apostles to have eaten *panem Dominum*, the bread that was their Lord, and Judas *panem Domini*, the bread of the Lord, it followeth at least, that to the apostles there was the real presence, howsoever it was to Judas, and consequently that this place maketh rather against Mr. Bell,* who denieth the *real presence*, than for him; yea, it proveth that the Papists do indeed eat, as they believe, *panem Dominum* with the apostles, and Mr. Bell *panem Domini* with Judas, forsomuch as the one do hold the bread in their communion to be changed substantially into Christ's flesh, and the other believeth theirs to be substantially bread, though yet the Lord's bread.

6. Now, as for explication and solution of this place, it did not seem to me to have so much difficulty, as that Mr. Bell should adventure the abnegation of his whole faith and religion once more upon the answer thereof.† For, first, if a man will say, that St. Augustine did mean that Judas did not receive the true eucharist at the last supper, but other bread, then is there no difficulty in these words of St. Augustine, for that this presupposed, it is evident, that the apostles and he did not eat the same thing,

* Panis Dominus, et panis Domini.

† Augustine, Ep. 162, tom. ii. et Tract 26 et 62 in Joan. tom. ix.

Mr. Bell's offer to return once again to Papistry if his argument be answered.

but the one the bread that was their Lord, and the other the bread that was of his Lord; but if we say, according to St. Augustine, that both of them did receive the eucharist, which I have found the said doctor to affirm in other parts of his works, then is the solution plain by St. Augustine's own immediate words cut off by Mr. Bell, for after that he had said: *Illi manducabant panem Dominum; ille panem Domini, contra Dominum*, he addeth presently: *illi vitam, iste panem: qui enim manducat indignè (ait apostolus) iudicium sibi manducat*. They (*the apostles*) did eat their life, he (*that is Judas*) his punishment, for that, as St. Paul saith, he that doth eat him unworthily, eateth to himself damnation. In which words the apostle seemeth plainly to say, that even the unworthy eater, *manducat eum*, eateth him (*to wit, Christ himself*), though to his own damnation, and thereby openeth a way to St. Augustine's explication, to wit, that albeit the apostles and Judas did eat the selfsame thing in substance, receiving the sacrament; yet, in regard of the contrary effects which it worketh in the receivers, the one may be called *panis Dominus*, bread that is the Lord, who is life to the receiver, and the other, *panis Domini contra Dominum*, bread of the Lord against the Lord, in him that receiveth unworthily, for that it worketh not life, which is the Lord, but death, punishment, and damnation, which is against the Lord and his intention. So as, albeit the eucharist that Judas received was in substance the selfsame Lord that the apostles eat; yet, in operation, it was against the Lord, who saith: *Ego sum panis vitæ*, I am the bread of life. And again, *If any eat of this bread he shall live for ever*. And yet further, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting*. No marvel then, if he that eateth his own damnation is said by St. Augustine not to eat *panem Dominum, qui vita est*, the bread that is Christ, and life itself; but *panem Domini contra Dominum*, the bread of Christ against Christ, not life, but punishment, saith St. Augustine. Which last words, I marvelled much to see Mr. Bell to have cut off, they being the explication of the former; especially seeing that he had protested in the place

Explication of
St. August-
ine's words.

before mentioned, *that if any man could answer these words of St. Augustine, or if any could convince him to have alleged any writer corruptly, or to have quoted any place guilefully, or to have charged any other falsely, he would change his religion again, and subscribe once more to the Papists.* So he. And the reader will easily judge what his obligation may arise to be, by such rash impawning himself, his faith, and religion upon such bargains.*

7. Not long after this again, treating of the Pope's dispensations, for exaggeration of abuses committed therein, he allegeth an example out of Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence,† “who affirmeth,” saith Mr. Bell, “*that Pope*

A case of dispensation untruly related out of Antoninus.

Martin the Fifth dispensed with one, who had contracted and consummated matrimony with his own natural and full sister, of the same father and mother;” citing these words of Antoninus, in Latin, *cum quadam ejus germana*, which he Englisheth, as you have heard, *his own natural and full sister, of the same father and mother*, cutting off half of the sentence that ensued, and confuted his falsification, *quam cognoverat fornicariè*, whom he had known in fornication, so as the sentence in Antoninus is, that Pope Martin the Fifth, upon a great suit and long deliberation, *did dispense with one that had married with the sister of her whom he had known in fornication*, that is to say, with his concubine's sister, which yet, by the canon law, he could neither marry nor live with her afterward without dispensation, in respect of the spiritual affinity that he had contracted with her by the former carnal knowledge of her sister; “which dispensation, notwithstanding,” saith Antoninus, “was hardly granted. And one chief reason of the grant was,” saith he, “for that the parties could not be separated without great scandal, nor were not fit to enter into religion.”

8. Here then, first, Mr. Bell seemeth to have dealt somewhat indiscreetly, for that promising to prove great abuses of Popes in granting dispensations in cases intolerable, he bringeth in this example, which, in my opinion, hath no great difficulty in it, even in England itself. For how many do marry, even without dis-

Sundry abuses.

* Bell, p. 40.

† Antoninus, 3 part, art. 1, c. 11.

pensation, with women whose sisters they have carnally known! And consequently the Papists will say, that it was not so great a matter for Pope Martin to dispense upon such reasonable and urgent causes, as Antoninus doth allege. And, secondly, he seemeth to deal unsincerely, in cutting off the half of Antoninus's words which most made to the purpose, for declaring his true meaning, as you have heard, to wit, that he had contracted and consummated marriage with the sister of her whom he had known in fornication, and thereby contracted affinity in the first degree; and, thirdly, he Englisheth the words, *rum germana ejus*, with his own natural and full sister, of the same father and mother; whereas he should have said, not with his, but with her sister, whom he had known in fornication, and should not have put in of his own the words, *full sister of the same father and mother*, which are not in Antoninus, nor cannot be verified; for that the woman known in fornication was not the husband's sister, but the wife's sister. And so here you see again, how Mr. Bell's band of renouncing his religion groweth still upon him by his rash and unsincere dealing.

9. After this again, he, treating of traditions, goeth about to answer a certain place of St. Augustine* writing against the Manichees concerning the great and high authority of the Catholic Church, saying: *Non crederem Evangelio, nisi me ecclesiæ auctoritas commoveret*: "I would not," saith St. Augustine, "give credit to the Gospel, nor believe it to be the Gospel, except the authority of the church did move me thereunto;" meaning, as I found by his whole discourse, reading over that place, that without the church he could not know what was the Gospel, and what was not. For in the same chapter he hath these words to the Manichean heretic against whom he wrote: "If thou," saith he, "canst find any manifest thing in the Gospel about the apostleship of Manicheus, thou shalt weaken the authority of Catholics with me, who bid me not to believe thee; which authority being once weakened, neither can I believe the Gospel which I received from

* Augustine contra Epist. Fundam. cap. 4, tom. 6.

them.”* To this place of St. Augustine, Mr. Bell answereth, “that there is a great difference between *movere* and *commovere*, because *movere*,” saith he, “is to move a part by itself, but *commovere* is to move together with another; and, therefore, if St. Augustine hath said, *non crederem Evangelio, nisi me ecclesiæ auctoritas moveret*, and not *commoveret*, it had been another matter; whereby he would signify, that *movere* doth import a more absolute or forcible motion than *commovere*.” Whereat, truly, I could not but smile; for that every dictionary will reprove this device; and, in Latin, I am sure *commovere*, in his own nature, signifieth a more vehement motion than *movere*. As if a man should say, *Oratio ejus movet, sed non commovet*, his speech moveth me somewhat, but doth not thoroughly prevail or persuade me.

10. The like shift or evasion, with some more note of ignorance or negligence, seemeth to me to have been used by Mr. Bell, when he treateth of the merit and reward of good works, where Englishing a sentence of Theodoret about that subject, to wit, *superant certamina coronæ*, the crowns of glory in heaven do surpass our labours or conflicts upon earth, Mr. Bell translateth the words thus, *The conflicts of the crown remain*, putting *coronæ* in the genitive case for the nominative, and *certamina* in the nominative for the accusative, and the verb (*supersunt*) in the place of *superant*; which yet it seemeth he could not do of any oversight, for that I found both the words and the sense to be plain in Theodoret, for that he, writing and commenting upon these words of St. Paul to the Romans, “The sufferings of this life are not worthy the future glory, which shall be revealed in us, &c.,” writeth thus: *Superant certamina coronæ, non comparantur cum laboribus remunerationes, labor enim parum est, sed magnum lucrum speratur*—“The crowns or rewards do surpass the conflicts, the rewards are not to be compared with the labours, for the labour is small, but the gain that is hoped for is great,” &c. So Theodoret,

* Bell, p. 137.

both in Greek * and Latin. Here then, again, me thinketh that Mr. Bell dealt not ingenuously, in setting down or translating this father's sentence, in that he both corrupteth the true meaning by false and childish translation, and cutteth off the hinder part of the sentence, which containeth the full explication of the former. And now, if this be not false and fraudulent dealing, I remit me to the reader. Sure I am, that he perplexed me greatly, making me to fear lest much of the rest that he writeth was of this kind; and yet I resolved not to exhibit any thing of this third book unto my Lord of Canterbury until I had seen my former doubts, which I had gathered out of his second book, some way satisfied by his lordship, or by some other at his appointment. And so with these notes for a supply, if need should require, I prepared myself to my journey: being possessed (to confess the truth) with no very good opinion of Mr. Bell's truth or sincerity in writing. And so I resolved to signify unto his grace if fit occasion should be offered.

* Theodor. Comment. in 8, ad Romanos.

[ὁ περιβαίνοισι τοὺς ἀγῶνας οἱ τίφανοι, οὐ συγκρίνονται τοῖς πόνοις αἱ ἀντιδόσεις· μικρὸς ὁ πόνος, ἀλλὰ πολὺ τὸ ἐλπιζόμενον κέρδος. Tom. iii. 87. Ed. Nosselt.]

CHAPTER X.

Of my Repair to London and Lambeth for exhibiting my fifth Appearance before my Lord of Canterbury, and of Mr. Dr. Covell's book in defence of Mr. Hooker, &c., and what he writeth of Mr. Calvin; and some other points concerning my purpose.

THE prefixed time of my obliged appearance drawing near, I repaired again to London, and upon the last day of Easter Term I went to Lambeth to present myself to my Lord of Canterbury, whom I found not at home, but at Westminster, where he had spent the forenoon of that day, and had dined there, by occasion of a great cause handled that morning in the Star Chamber before him and the other lords of the council and nobility, who came from the court, that then lay at Greenwich, to be present at the hearing of that cause, which was about the legitimation of Sir Robert Dudley, son to the late Earl of Leicester; by which occasion I expected a good while at Lambeth before the archbishop returned, though in his absence there sat, as I understood, divers doctors and prelates about other matters appertaining to religion in his said house at Lambeth; but I thought not best to present myself before them, but rather to stay until my lord himself came, though indeed I would willingly have talked apart with Dr. Covell, but he was not there, and have proposed somewhat to him concerning his book against the Puritans, entitled "A just and temperate Defence of the Five Books of Ecclesiastical Polity," written by Mr. Richard Hooker, and set forth by Mr. William Covell, a little before, to wit, anno 1603, which book, as I found it to be written with a far different spirit from that of Mr. Bell's, being very mild, grave,

The title of
Dr. Covell's
book.

sweet and charitable, as to me it seemed (the contrary vices and defects whereof I found in the other); so yet were there many things which made me greatly to muse, for that he seemed to me to hold divers opinions far different from those of other Protestants, as may be seen in every one or most of his articles, which are in number twenty-one. But two only will I name in this place, about which especially I thought to deal with him in particular; the one about the Roman Church, which he affirmeth to have been for many ages *the true mother church of Christendom*,* and denieth not, but that at this day it is a member and limb, though imperfect, of the church of Christ: and that in that church men may be saved, which commonly other Protestants do deny, making her the whore of Babylon, and spouse of Antichrist, as Mr. Dr. Downham said unto me, that he had substantially proved in a book of his; and when I told him of this other more mild assertion of Dr. Covell's, he answered me, as before I have touched, that he was but a young man, though by their looks I discerned no great difference in their ages, but very great, by their books, in their judgments and opinions. And for that I may chance to have occasion to speak of this matter again afterward, I mean about Dr. Covell's doctrine concerning the church, I will here say no more.

2. But in another article, which is the nineteenth, against the Puritans, entitled "Of Calvin and the Reformed Churches," for that it was a principal point of my former doubts, arising out of the "Defence of the Censure," and the relation there made of the life and doctrine, both of Luther and Calvin,† as you have heard; I must speak a word or two more here, telling the reader first that I now perceived in part, or at least persuaded myself so, why Dr. Covell, when I was first remitted unto him, was so backward and unwilling to wade further in satisfying me about the objections made against the persons and doctrines of Luther and Calvin, to wit, both for that the histories could hardly be reprov'd, and for that it seemeth he had no great good estimation himself of them and their proceedings; forso-

That Mr.
Covell writeth
of Mr. Cal-
vin.

* Dr. Covell, in his Defence, art. 11.

† Cap. 2, diff. 2.

much as, in the sixth article of his said book, "Of Faith and Good Works," he plainly rejecteth and condemneth both Luther's and the Puritans' doctrine, which is the same of Calvin about justification by bare faith, or, as he allegeth, the Puritans' phrase—*naked faith*.^{*} And, in his aforesaid nineteenth article, "Of Calvin and the Reformed Churches," he, joining Luther and Calvin both together, avoucheth two things: *First, that it is injurious to the Church of England to make these two men authors of that religion among us, saith he, which by many hundred years is far more ancient than they both were. Secondly, to lay the infirmities that were in them (being men, it were too great ignorance and flattery to acquit them of all imperfections in that kind), even upon the religion itself.* So he.

3. But in both these points I had great difficulties. In the first, for that the religion of England at this day, consisting of a distinct church and form, both of doctrine, number of sacraments, and administration thereof, from other churches, and, namely, the Papists; albeit we do suppose that the points of doctrine came in substance from Christ, which, notwithstanding, is in controversy between us and our adversaries; yet me seemed that we cannot deny but that the external form of religion now used in England (whereby we differ from the Papists that held another form before), must needs be ascribed originally and principally to these two men, as to the first authors, gatherers, and propounders thereof; so that, in this sense, it cannot be more ancient by so many ages, as Dr. Covell saith, than they that were the first and chief setters forth thereof, seeing in our country it was never known or practised before their times, as the Catholics pretend to deduce by many demonstrations of histories and other proofs; and I have heard by the confession of very good Protestants, that they have known divers learned Papists to stand upon this issue with us among other points, that if it could be proved unto them that ever, in England or in any other country of the Christian world, there had been extant or in use any church or congregation never so little, either of Catholics or here-

My first difficulty out of Mr. Covell's words.

* Page 130.

tics, before the time of Martin Luther and Calvin; that agreed with the present Church of England in all points of doctrine, number and form of sacraments, jurisdiction ecclesiastical, and other such points; that is to say, that they held and practised no more nor less than the English Protestants now do, that then they would be content to be Protestants, which thing caused great difficulty to me in the first point set down by Dr. Covell; to wit, that the modern English religion and form of sacraments and government therein, as it maketh a several church from the Roman, was extant in England many ages before Luther and Calvin taught their doctrine.

4. The second point also seemed not so clear to me; which is, that the credit of a religion may not be brought in doubt by the faults of some principal men that are the first propounders, framers, or founders thereof. For, albeit all true religion be from God, yet, so long as the matter lieth in question whether such religion be true or no, it importeth greatly to consider whether that the said first framers or propounders, by whom it is avouched that God revealed that religion, were men of credit and fidelity, or no. As if a man that is no Christian should deliberate with himself to embrace the Christian faith, it were much to the purpose for him to consider whether the apostles and their successors, that first framed and founded the Christian church, and preached the doctrine thereof, as coming from God, were honest men, and witnesses worthy of faith and credit, or no. And if it could be proved that they were liars, or of notorious naughty life, or that they had deceived men guilefully in their teaching, or did contradict or impugn themselves the one the other, it must needs be a great motive unto him not to believe their doctrine, nor follow their church, as ordained by God. For, albeit they should say that their doctrine was not theirs, but from God, and that their faults and infirmities ought not to prejudice the religion which they taught (as Dr. Covell doth say of Luther and Calvin); yet might he that did thus deliberate say, that it is not likely that God would use such bad men for the first authors of so great a good

the second
difficulty.

A comparison
worthy of con-
sideration.

as is the first planting of true religion; and that he, finding them false and deceitful in other matters, might justly suspect, lest, in this also, they were not to be believed when they say they were sent or raised by God for founding of that religion.

5. And this was my very doubt about Luther and Calvin, who, if they were so bad men as the testimonies alleged by the "Defence of the Censure" do make them

Bad men can hardly be supposed to be authors of good religion.

I cannot possibly persuade myself that the religion can be good which was framed or founded and published to the world by them; for that

I cannot think that Almighty God would ever use such instruments to so high and excellent an end. And therefore I marvelled much why my Lord of Canterbury and his doctors should be so slack in giving my conscience satisfaction in this behalf; forsomuch as this my scruple was founded in so substantial a point, wherein I had thought to have urged somewhat earnestly Dr. Covell, if I had met with him; but, as afterward I understood, he was much occupied about that time in wooing a certain gentlewoman, which, as they say, was afterward his wife.

6. But to return to Mr. Calvin, of whom Dr. Covell doth principally treat in this article, though, in divers exquisite forms of phrases, he endeavoureth to honour him, or at leastwise to mitigate the hard speeches of Mr. Hooker about him, which so greatly offended the Puritans; yet, in effect, he saith little or nothing for his justification, but granteth in fine words that which my Lord of Canterbury himself, in his book of "Dangerous Positions," and Dr. Sutcliffe, in his "Survey of the Disciplinary Doctrine," some years before, had uttered in more plain terms against him; shewing him, indeed, by his own letters, negotiations, and practices, and by the records of Geneva itself, to have been one of the most shifting and canvassing men that ever I read of; which Dr. Covell also, in effect, uttereth in these words:—"There is not one word in Mr. Hooker," saith he, "sounding to any other end towards Mr. Calvin, but to shew how his great wisdom wrought upon their weakness (to

Mr. Covell's speech of Calvin.

wit, them of Geneva), his knowledge upon their ignorance, his gravity upon their inconstancy, his zeal upon their disorders, only to establish that government, *which, howsoever not necessary for other places, was fit enough, peradventure, for that town.*"* So he. And do you see how Mr. Calvin is defended?—how his wit and wisdom is praised for bringing under the Genevians, and for putting himself in chief authority there, by overthrow of his adversary ministers and citizens? If you read the fore-named book, you shall find Mr. Calvin was driven out of Geneva into banishment, and that, after three years, by his wit (so much commended here), restored himself again, and put down all his enemies. And this is one high commendation; but let us hear another, very eloquently uttered.

7. "How far all men are bound," saith Dr. Covell, "to speak of those whom they reverence and love, and yet in some cases do think not safe to follow, this is that error that hath deceived many; for from hence the private oversights of those (who, how famous and excellent soever, were but men) have grown, by the violence of some of their followers, to be stiffly maintained as undoubted truths; as though there were no difference betwixt being a man not always erring, and not erring at all. The one is a worthy happiness, granted to some few; the other a special privilege, not permitted to any merely men—no, not to Mr. Calvin himself. This serveth to teach us, that for those things which we do and believe we have better warrant than man's invention, and that no man, how excellent soever, except Christ, may and ought precisely to be followed in all that he doth."

8. Thus far are Mr. Covell's words of Calvin; wherein it seemeth to me that Dr. Covell doth covertly lance him, though with pouring oil into the wound, that it smart not; affirming, first, that he was but a man, and thereby subject to error, though not always an erring man; that it is not safe to follow him in his ecclesiastical form of the church, which was but man's invention; that he had no privilege

*The explication
of Mr. Co-
vells rhetori-
cal speech of
Mr. Calvin.*

from error; that the English Church hath better warrant for that they hold, (contrary to him) than he for his. Which principles being laid, I do not see why we may not call any other thing also into question which Mr. Calvin teacheth or doth. Yea, for the weakening of Mr. Calvin's absolute credit, he setteth down this general proposition against all men whatsoever, not excepting the very apostles themselves; *that no man, how excellent soever, except Christ, may, or ought, precisely to be followed in all that he doth*;* whereas, notwithstanding, St. Paul propoundeth himself to be followed, saying, *Imitatores mei estote &c.*—Be ye followers of me, or, take me for your example as I am a follower of Christ.

9. Well, then, by these and other such like speeches methought I perceived the mean opinion which indeed Dr. Covell and his lord, had of Calvin, though, as I say, sometimes some ointments of friendly phrases were poured forth upon him, to mitigate the rejection made of him wherein he pleaseth them not; and so Dr. Covell in this place saith Mr. Hooker's opinion to have been, that Mr. Calvin *was the wisest man comparably that ever the French Church did enjoy since the hour it enjoyed him*; which seemed to me no great praise in such a person of his vocation; for that his wit only is here commended, which may be very great in a very evil man; and yet this is moderated presently by Mr. Doctor, saying, *that men of best judgment and understanding will be ready enough to give him that which belonged unto him, if some private men, out of their love and zeal, did not too greatly overload him with it.* And then, after a very few lines, he goeth forward to recite some particulars, wherein his wit did most shew itself.

Two points
praised in Mr.
Calvin.

10. *Two things, saith he, there are of principal moment, which have deservedly procured him honour throughout the world. The one, his exceeding pain in composing the "Institutions of Christian Religion"; the other, his no less industrious travails in exposition of Holy Scriptures, &c.* About the first of these two I have little to say; for that indeed the writing his

four books of Christian Institutions was a painful and labour-
some work ; yet, having read them over, or, at least,
the greatest part thereof, I observed two things : the one,
that, for the method itself, he took it the most part from
Peter Lombard, called the Master of the Sen-
tences, who, as I understand, first drew all di-
vinity into four books ; whereof the first did
treat of God and his attributes or properties ; the second,
of angels, men, and other creatures, as they proceed from
God ; the third, of the incarnation of Christ, and his life
and doctrine ; the fourth, of the sacraments, as means left
by Christ to further man's salvation ; which selfsame meth-
od being observed by Mr. Calvin, leaveth unto him less
part of the commendation thereof, as the Papists do say.

Peter Lombard,
Master
of the Sen-
tences.

11. The other point observed by me was, that all the
substance of doctrine wherein Papists and Protestants
agree with the Fathers' sayings concerning the same, is
set down by the said *Master of Sentences*, and by those
that wrote commentaries upon him, which were many.
And whereinsoever they differ, as, namely, in all matters
of controversy, the chief arguments of Mr. Calvin are
taken out of the objections made and answered by the
said writers, though he do urge them more exactly, and
much more eloquently, than they did, who put them down
briefly.

12. As for the other point of his exposition of the Scrip-
tures, it happened out strangely that, about this very time,
I fell upon a book written by one Dr. Ægidius Hunnius,
public reader of divinity in the Lutheran university of Wittemberg, in Germany,
printed in the same place A.D. 1564 ; which
Protestant doctor, taking upon himself purposely to handle
this point of Mr. Calvin's exposition of Scripture, hath
this assertion in the beginning of his book ; that he will
shew most clearly and evidently, *quòd Joannes Calvinus*
illustrissima Scripturæ Sacræ loca et testimonia de gloriosa
Trinitate, Deitate Christi, et Spiritus Sancti, cùm primis
autem vaticinia prophetarum, de adventu Messie, nativitate
ejus, passione, resurrectione, ascensione in celos, et sessione
ad dexteram Dei, detestandum in modum corrumpere non

Dr. Hunnius's
judgment of
Mr. Calvin's
writing upon
the Scriptures.

exhorruit.—"That Mr. John Calvin, in his commentaries upon the Bible, was not afraid to corrupt most detestably the most clearest places and testimonies of Holy Scripture concerning the glorious Trinity, the Godhead of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost; and principally the foretellings of prophets, of the coming of the Messias, his nativity, passion, and resurrection, ascension into heaven, and his sitting at the right hand of God;" all which articles (*saith this doctor*) doth Mr. Calvin wilfully corrupt in his expositions, in the favour of Jews, Arians, and other such enemies of Christ; which he proveth by alleging above forty or fifty places (if I remember well); citing Mr. Calvin's own words and commentaries thereupon so clearly and perspicuously against the sense and exposition of all holy fathers, as, if his commentaries therein be to be admitted, these forenamed points or articles of Christian religion cannot be defended against the foresaid adversaries of Christ's name.

Holv Dr. Hunnius's judgment of Mr. Calvin did trouble my mind.

13. All which, verily, did so greatly trouble me, as I could not tell what to say or think therein; for the book of Dr. Hunnius is extant to be read of all men, and his proofs did seem to me irrefragable; for he citeth Mr. Calvin's own words for every corruption he allegeth. So as if his narration be true, Mr. Dr. Covell's rare commendation of his exposition of Holy Scripture falleth to the ground. And about this would I have conferred with him gladly, if I might have had commodity, though I persuaded myself it would have been to little purpose, but only to have afflicted him more; for that I imagined how little, in effect, he could be able to answer in this, but only by rejecting Dr. Hunnius's accusations, who yet is held at this day for a famous and learned divine. And for that I saw him very unwilling to enter into any examination of Mr. Calvin's affairs when before I proposed unto him those things which the "Defence of the Censure" had alleged, therefore I thought best to let the matter pass for the present, until I had examined things further, and might, peradventure, have fitter occasion to return unto him again at some other time, when he should be at home, and more at leisure.

And therefore, laying aside these cogitations for the present, I turned my thoughts to consider what I should answer to my Lord of Canterbury himself concerning such things as he should demand of me, especially about Mr. Bell's books; out of which I determined to present unto him only, at the first, some of those notes which I had gathered out of the first two; to wit, the "Anatomy," and the "Survey of Popery," which his grace had commended unto me to be read, reserving the third, and the notes taken thereof, for a supply, if he should answer, or make small account of the first. And, being in these cogitations, I was advertised that my lord had come from Westminster indeed, and that his barge was arrived; whereupon I retired myself towards the hall, to expect his passage that way, meaning so to place myself as that he should see me at least as he passed by; for that there were so many there to give petitions, and for other businesses, as I might doubt lest his lordship might pass by without casting his eye upon me.

CHAPTER XI.

How, my Lord returning from Westminster, I made my appearance; and what passed in the same. How I was finally referred to Mr. Doctor Barlow, Dean of Chester, and so dismissed again unto the end of the next term; and what Conference I had with the said Doctor Barlow.

BUT now at length my lord came home, and a great train with him, and I, to be seen the better by him at his passage into his palace, placed myself, as now I have said within, in the hall, that his grace might behold me as he passed by; but it may be that his distractions in other things did not permit him to look upon me with any great attention; and in particular there was a young man that also placed himself purposely to be seen by his grace at his passing by, who, as I partly understood, was upon sliding back from the Roman religion, or, at least, there was some hope thereof; and for that cause was retained there, as I think, in the house. He seemed to be some scholar, or young priest; but I could not certainly learn his name. There was also a certain schoolmaster's wife, that gave up a petition in her husband's name, that was in prison for the Roman religion, in the White Lion, as I remember; she suing for some release or relief of her husband. But my lord seemed to hearken little unto her, but rather to use hard words; and so passed into his garden; but, after coming to sit down among his doctors, she was called into the parlour, and there, being on her knees, my lord told the doctors what a dangerous Papist her husband was, and how long he had sought to catch him; and so, at length, he bid her stand up, and dismissed her with a cold answer.

2. With this woman, before she was called in, I had some speech, and learning the state and cause of her husband's troubles, I told her that I was in some trouble also myself about like matters, though hitherto I were no Papist. I inquired also of the prison where her husband was, meaning to come acquainted with him, though afterward I could not come to see him.

3. But now, to return to my lord; he went, as I said, presently after his return, into his garden, to see certain workmen that were building there; whereupon I, with divers others, went in from the hall to a certain passage between the garden and his parlour, to expect him there; and so he, coming out of his garden, cast his eye upon me, among others in that place, and presently said unto me, with a friendly countenance and somewhat a low voice, "Now, Mr. Walsingham, how do you? are you satisfied?" To whom I answered, "No, truly, my lord; I am not yet satisfied." Whereto he replied nothing, but went and sat down at his table in the parlour, together with his doctors and prelates about him; whither, after a little time, I was called, in like manner; and then my lord began to explain my case unto them, and to tell them what scruples I had conceived upon the reading of a Papist book, and how I had delivered up the same unto the king's majesty, with a memorial, desiring that matters in that book contained, especially of fact, might be examined; and if they were found false, that then the Papists might be more severely punished; if true, then that his majesty, as head of the church, would give me licence to believe them. And he further signified unto them, that his majesty had remitted me to his grace, and what pains he had taken, and others at his appointment, for my satisfaction; and, finally, that he had delivered unto me two books of Mr. Bell's, written against the Papists, to satisfy and resolve me withal; and then he, calling me close unto him, at the table's end, asked me very seriously whether I had read them, and what I thought of them.

Now I was called into the parlour and my cause treated.

4. To this I answered, that I had read them over with diligence, and that my judgment was, that the author was

^{My judgment given to my lord of Mr. Bell's writing.} a golden Bell, but his sound like as of a brazer candlestick; which I said in respect of the many *golden advices, inferences, and corollaries, and the golden sentences* which he mentioneth so often in his books; but that his sound was no better than of brass, according to the apostle's similitude; for that he seemed not only to have no charity in his writing, but neither truth or sincerity in his allegations, as before you have seen, by that which I have noted out of him.

5. The archbishop hearing me call him a *golden Bell*, in the first part of my answer, seemed much contented, saying, "That is well;" but, hearing the second, demanded "Why so?" And Dr. Barlow,* Dean of Chester and Prebend of Westminster, looking back upon me with more displeasure, as it seemed, than the rest, said, "Why what say you to Mr. Bell?" And all the other doctors in like manner, cast their eyes upon me; but I gave the reason before mentioned; and then my lord answering and willing me to shew wherein I had made that observation, I laid forth upon the table before them the two books that I had perused, turning to the places before mentioned out of St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and other fathers which I pretended to have been untruly alleged by him, presupposing that my lord would presently have commanded the said fathers' works to have been brought forth out of his study, and the places quoted to be examined in all their presence; but no such matter ensued for my lord, having slightly looked over the places in Bell, as he citeth them, he laid them down again, and the doctors presently took them up to peruse them; in which ^{My lord's gentle speech with me about Luther.} mean space his lordship began to talk somewhat privately and mildly with me concerning things objected by the "Defence of the Censure" against Luther, signifying his dislike that I should be so much moved by them, and in particular with the doctrines objected against Luther. To whom I said, "And will not your lordship have me moved to hear him teach that if a woman have an impotent husband, she may go

* After Bishop of Lincoln.

lie privily with some other man, or with her husband's brother?" Whereto his lordship answered, "And do not you think that divorces, in such cases, may be allowed?" "Yea, my lord," quoth I, "upon just causes; but never, I trow, in secret, nor to lie with her husband's brother."

6. And with this my lord, answering me no further, began to talk unto Doctor Barlow, who this while, with the rest, was looking on Bell's books, and began to speak somewhat concerning them, seeming to maintain somewhat a good opinion of Bell's fidelity, which yet appeared not to be great with my lord himself, as by some conjectures I gathered. But none of them, as I said, so much as once offered to call for the fathers' works themselves, to examine the places, which was my desire; but, after some few words to and fro among themselves, my lord commanded me to stand aside whiles they talked.

7. Whereupon, I retiring myself by little and little down to the lower end of the parlour, that they might confer more freely, they talked together of this and other matters; and after some little time, having despatched away the foresaid schoolmaster's wife, my lord began to speak with a high and angry voice concerning me and my affairs, and, looking towards me, complained of my importunity and obstinacy, and said to the doctors, that he would send me to prison; and thereupon, calling for his pursuivant or apparitor (which presently appeared), said: "Let a *mittimus* be made to send him to the Clink;" which the officer seemed very forward to have executed; but belike he understood my lord's manner of speech to be but a threat.

8. But here now I felt within me come conflict about this matter of going to prison; for as, on the one side, I found in myself an inclination, or rather full resolution, to suffer imprisonment, or any other disgrace, rather than to do any thing against my conscience; so, on the other side, I thought with myself what discredit, besides loss and hinderance, it might be to me to suffer imprisonment or open disgrace for opinion of

My lord's
change in
speech and
proceeding.

My perplexity
about going to
prison.

Papistry, which ever heretofore I had hated, and had not yet resolved ever to admit or embrace, but only had demanded solution of certain doubts. I thought, also, how my friends and kindred would wonder and complain thereof, that I should suffer myself to be cast into prison for matter of conscience, and for making recourse to the king's majesty in a business so important to myself as concerning my soul. But, in fine, I concluded with myself to suffer whatsoever should come; and yet I was of opinion that my lord would not commit me indeed, lest his majesty, hearing of it, should not allow of such manner of solving doubts, arising upon so good grounds as mine did, and so indifferently proposed, with requiring only to have the truth declared.

9. But now, while I was in these cogitations and conflicts of mind, there came unto me, from the other side of the parlour, the knight of the corner, mentioned by me before, who, out of show of great compassion, and extraordinary friendship, began with divers temporal reasons to persuade me not to meddle further in these matters, but to accommodate myself to my lord's will, and I should find his grace a good lord unto me, and ready to perform as occasion should be offered; that these matters of controversies did not appertain to my profession; and divers other like reasons, all tending to worldly commodities and temporal respects. But I told him that I, being now entered into the ministry, and meaning, by God's grace, to go forward therein, whose office must be to teach and instruct others, good reason it was that I should seek first to instruct myself; and for that cause, finding no other solution of my doubts, I repaired to his majesty, and was by him remitted to my lord and his doctors, to be resolved in my said doubts. Whereto the knight replied nothing concerning that point which was the substance of all, but only inculcated unto me again what danger I was in, and how like I was to go to prison, and thereby to suffer no small disgrace and hinderance; but he never offered to confer with me, or to go about to resolve my difficulties,

Sir Christopher Perkins.

The knight's persuasion unto me.

as I understood afterward that he had been able to do ; for that he had been a priest and public reader of Roman divinity for divers years in Germany, before he came to enjoy the temporal commodities of England ; and, consequently, was best able, if he had listed, to have given solution to my doubts ; but he never so much as once named any point of religion, but left me as he found me, when he saw that these human respects wrought nothing with me ; wherein he seemed to deal with me rather like a knight than like a priest or Jesuit, and, consequently, to esteem more of his knighthood than his priesthood.

10. And now, for that my sending to prison was thus delayed, my lord's apparitor was busy with me The apparitor. to stand near and to shew myself, fearing, be- like, lest my lord should forget me and my cause, and so he miss his fee ; but I told him that it needed not, I was sure his grace would have me in memory. And, after a little time, they rose from the table, and, standing on foot, my lord shewing himself much displeased, talked again of me and my business, threatening to send me to prison ; but after that, again he retired himself into a window, together with Dr. Barlow, who, having conferred some little space together, my lord called me unto him, and insinuating unto me that the said doctor had entreated for some favour towards me, said : " Well, Mr. Walsingham, I am content you shall confer these places with Mr. Dean here (meaning the said Dr. Barlow), who My remission to confer with Dr. Barlow. will take some pains with you to resolve you."

And then, turning unto Mr. Doctor, he said unto him, " You can shew him, Mr. Dean, Chrysostom, both in Greek and Latin ;" and so, willing me to repair unto him for conference, dismissed me, with saying only that I should return unto him again in the end of the next term ; and indeed his dismission was such, and with such countenance and speech, as it seemed to me that he could not well determine what to do with me, being weary of me and of my suit, and that he could have been content to be handsomely rid of me ; yet he willed me to take with me Mr. Bell's books again, which lay upon the table, though

I would gladly have left them there: [but, seeing they were still thus thrust upon me, after I had been dismissed from Dr. Barlow, and came to find some better satisfaction of my doubts, I committed both my lord's books, with divers other of mine own, unto a fair fire, and felt myself not a little recreated with the sight of such a flame.] And now, this was my dismissal from my Lord of Canterbury, who never sent for me more, nor did I return unto him, upon the causes which after shall appear.

11. Upon the next day, which was Sunday, I repaired to Westminster to Mr. Dr. Barlow, who, after even-song, went up with me to his study, and there, at my request, opened first one of St. Augustine's tomes, wherein the book *de Bono Viduitatis* is contained, and there sought for the place before named, cited by Mr. Bell; and, falling upon the words alleged by him, read them, and would have seemed to defend them, as there they lie; but when I pressed him to have him go forward, and to read the words ensuing, which do explicate St. Augustine's meaning, and wholly overthrow Mr. Bell's purpose, as before hath been shewed, he was unwilling at that time to pass any further, especially his man coming to tell him that it was now supper-time; and so, with courteous words, he dismissed me, saying, notwithstanding, that if, at any other time, I would come unto him, he would be glad to spend an hour, and take some further pains with me. But I thought with myself, to what end should I come unto him, and trouble both him and myself, seeing it was but to weary and molest him, as I had done many others in the same cause before; for that I seemed to perceive now how little they were able or willing to give me that satisfaction in these points which I demanded about my doubts and scruples. And with this I departed from him, not meaning to return again for the present, but to take some other course, as afterward I did. And this may suffice for the first part of my narration, wherein I have set down sincerely, as near as I could remember, what passed in my sundry appearances before my Lord of Canterbury, and conferences with others;

My brief conference with Dr. Barlow.

MY CONFERENCE WITH DR. BARLOW, AND DISMISSION. 119

wherein not receiving the satisfaction I desired, as now you have perceived, I took another resolution upon me, to examine books of both sides, for finding out truth or falsity, beginning first with the writings of Protestants, and afterward of Catholics, as by the sequel you will see.

THE END OF THE FIRST PART.

THE SECOND PART OF THIS TREATISE, CONCERNING MY
SEARCH OF PROTESTANT WRITERS AND WRITINGS.

CHAPTER I.

What resolution I took after I was dismissed by my Lord of Canterbury ; and how I came to confer with a learned man of the Catholic side in prison : and of a new obligation that I took upon me to read and examine further, both Protestant and Catholic authors, for trial of two points that pressed me much.

WHEN I was thus dismissed by my lord, and, in effect, also by Mr. Dean of Chester, I began to think with myself what I should now do, and what way I should take to quiet my conscience, which I felt to be much more troubled than ever before. For, as on the one side I had no serious inclination to be a Papist, but rather a great aversion from the same ; so my confidence in the Protestant religion was so shaken by that which had passed with my lord and his doctors, as methought I durst rely very little upon that side ; for that now two points among others seemed to me to be very probable, if not clear and evident. The first, that my lord and his learned men were not able to satisfy me indeed, and with reality of truth, in the doubts I proposed, both out of the “ Defence of the Censure ” and Mr. Bell’s book ; and in this I seemed to myself fully resolved, for that otherwise they would have dealt, no doubt, after a more round and effectual way with me, seeing me so urgent and instant to be satisfied, and the cause of my satisfaction commended unto them by the king himself.

2. The second point was (wherein yet I was not so fully

determined) that Protestant writers used not fidelity in their writings, nor alleged things against the Papists with sincerity of truth; which, though it seemed very probable to me, by that I had noted both out of the "Defence of the Censure" concerning Mr.

A great doubt about the fidelity of Protestant writers.

Charke, and out of Mr. Bell; yea, and, in some points also, out of Mr. Calvin, Mr. Beza, and Mr. Jewell; yet I durst not resolve myself fully therein until I had made further search and trial of the matter. For that two cogitations did somewhat check this apprehension of mine; the first, that perhaps this fault which I observed in Mr. Bell might be proper to him alone, or at leastwise principally to be found in him, and so no reason to condemn all, or the most part, for one. The other cogitation was, that perhaps Papist writers also might be found to do the like, every one striving to defend the part which he followeth, either by right or wrong, truth or falsity, and then were there no certainty of either side, whereby a man might determine himself, all things standing only in show, and probability of speech, and shifting of sharp wits, which were a pitiful and miserable estate for matters of religion to stand in. And yet I was then moved the more to this cogitation, for that some Protestant writers of our days, and, namely, Mr. Dr. Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter, in all his books lightly written against the Papists (which are not few), doth set down catalogues of lyings, shifts, and falsehoods used by them in their writings, as, namely, of Cardinal Bellarmine, Baronius, F. Persons, and the rest.

Dr. Sutcliffe.

3. Upon which fight and combat of contrary cogitations, I resolved myself at length upon a great labour, but yet necessary to the quieting of my conscience as then I thought, which was first to run over all the chief Protestant books that I could get, to examine the sincerity or falsehood of their allegations in his behalf, and then to peruse, in like manner, the untruths and falsifications objected by Protestants against Papists, to see what substance or weight they have in reality of truth. And, in this enterprise, I purposed with myself to observe a very strict order and severity in my search; which was, not to admit,

A new resolution taken for my better satisfaction.

Note.

or censure for a lie, every thing that is objected for an untruth, but only such things, as being discovered, and found such as they are objected, both parties must needs grant to be fraudulent dealing. And these kinds of untruths being most certain signs of a naughty conscience and a bad cause, that cannot be defended but with lies and falsifications (God's cause needing no such unlawful and indirect helps to hold it up), are the only subject which I mean to handle in this search.

4. This then being my resolution, I began to think with myself what might be needful unto me for performance of the same. And, first of all, I thought it not amiss that forsomuch as hitherto I had never talked with any learned Papist all my life, now I should do it, if I might find fit commodity and security for the same; for that still I was afraid, that if my Lord of Canterbury should call me to him again, as I presumed he would if I returned not of myself, he would examine me again upon mine oath as in the beginning he did, whether I had talked with any Papist or no; the which I, being always very loath to bring any man into trouble, was desirous to avoid. It stayed me also somewhat to consider, that if I should have conference with any such man, and he should press me (with arguments which I could not answer) to become a Papist, what I should then do in that case; forsomuch as I had no determination that way, as before I have said, but rather a great repugnance. And yet, finally, having well thought of the matter, and finding myself greatly troubled thereabout, I resolved, by help of a certain gentleman of my acquaintance, who was somewhat inclined that way, though no whit resolved therein, to have some speech with one in prison that was learned indeed; with whom after I had, at sundry times, had somewhat large conferences, and proposed my doubts, and had heard his answers, as also their ground about divers controversies in religion, though I felt myself not fully able to answer him, yet I stood stiff not to yield, but to stand and continue in my former Protestant religion until I should have seen and examined matters further. Whereupon I de-

my delibera-
tion to speak
with some
learned Catho-
lic.

parted into the country within very few days, though afterward I returned again to London somewhat oftener than before upon divers occasions falling out.

5. Another point necessary to the search which I intended was, as I thought, to inform myself of certain principal Catholic books, whereby I might see and learn for certain what the said Catholics in every controversy between us and them did hold; for that I found by experience, and by the issue also of the foresaid conference with the forenamed learned man of their side, that divers things are avouched by the Protestants, as he said, to be held by Papists, which indeed they hold not; and that the most learned Papists do greatly complain thereof, saying, that the state of the question between them is never almost set down rightly by the Protestants, but with some addition or alteration of their own, charging* them still with things which they do not hold, and consequently do impugn matters of their own invention instead of positions of their adversaries. Wherefore, to avoid these *mistakings*, as Dr. Covell termeth them, I thought best to inform myself of their chief books, whereon they rely for their common opinions generally received amongst them.

6. For by this conference I perceived that the said Catholics have two sorts of opinions among them; the one, which are called *positiones de fide*, positions or assertions which men are bound to believe as matters of faith, whose truth is not disputable, but received and acknowledged by the church as determined truths; other opinions that are not so determined and received, though they appertain to matters of faith and religion;† yet may they be disputed of, by way of reason and argument, *salva fidei compage*, that is, without breach of the unity, or integrity, of faith, as, out of St. Augustine's words, they allege.

7. Now then, which be of the first sort, and which be of the second, and consequently which require obedience of belief, and which do admit liberty of dispute or discussion, I understood might be

What I informed myself of Catholic school writers.

* See P. 2, c. 3, n. 3, 4; and *ibid.* c. 3, n. 11, 13, 14, and c. 10, n. 5, 6, 7, 8, &c.

† Aug. tom. vii. l. 4; Com. Julia, c. 2.

known by certain books of theirs, public and common to them all; as, namely, if we talk of all divinity, the four books before mentioned of Peter Lombard, Master of the Sentences, is held by them to be the first methodical work, that drew all divinity into a certain form, whereas particular fathers and doctors, before that time, did handle but every one a piece, though St. Augustine handled more points than any, yet not all, nor in that form and method as that the writings of all others, both Scriptures, councils, and ecclesiastical decrees, might be reduced thereunto, as they were afterward to the said method of the Master of the Sentences, by sundry learned authors that made commentaries upon the said Sentences,

Alexander de
Hales.

St. Thomas,
of Aquin.

of whom the first and principal is accounted, say they, our learned countryman Alexander de Hales, and after him again, St. Thomas, of Aquin, who not only wrote Commentaries upon the said Sentences, but made a Sum of Divinity in like manner of his own, reducing all to three heads, or parts, the first pertaining to God alone, where do enter all disputes both about God in his own nature, and as he created the world; the second, to man alone, containing both his end which is beatitude, and all the means that may help or hinder him thereunto, which are virtues and vices; the third, to God and man, which is Christ our Saviour; and this part comprehendeth both his incarnation, life, death, resurrection, and ascension, as also the benefits left by him of holy sacraments in his church, and true use thereof.

8. And for that this Sum of St. Thomas, of Aquin, comprehendeth all lightly that the Catholics hold in matters of religion, though in every thing that is not *de fide*, but at liberty to dispute, as before is said, every man is not bound to follow his judgment or opinion; yet learned I this, that he was one of the most universally admitted school doctors that the Catholics have, and consequently fit to shew what indeed they do hold in every point. And thus I was answered when I inquired for some such general author as was universally admitted by all Catholics; I mean these three were proposed unto me as principal above the rest, in respect of the whole corps of scholastical divinity,

which is handled by them, though they advertised me in like manner, that the Catechism of Petrus Canisius, in these our days, which hath annexed the sentences of the fathers at large, would much help me to this effect.

The large Catechism of Petrus Canisius.

9. But now I was further told, that if I desired special books for controversies of these times, many might be assigned; as first, for times past since Wickliffe began in England, the most learned and methodical of all other is held our countryman Thomas Walden, who wrote divers volumes against Wickliffe's opinions, whereof they said that many are held also at this day by Protestants. Of this man's works I heard great praises, as that he was confessor to King Henry the Fifth, and a man of singular virtue in life, and of great prudence, besides his learning. But now, in our time, many more have written of all nations, as Cardinal Hosius, of Polonia; Joannes à Lovanio; and Richardus Tapper, in Flanders; Bishop Claudius Xaimetes, of France; Dominicus and Petrus à Soto, of Spain; Dr. Harding, Dr. Sanders, Dr. Allen, Dr. Stapleton, and many other of our countrymen, both in Latin and English, who severally handle divers parts of controversies. But for the whole body, was commended to me above all, the works of Cardinal Bellarmine, who, in three tomes or volumes, with exceeding good method and order, and perspicuity of style, doth set down, said they, all the controversies raised up in our days since the beginning of Luther, who though he be held for brief and pithy in regard of the multiplicity of matters which he handleth, yet are there to be seen in those three tomes or volumes, threescore and six books, and above a thousand and three hundred chapters, every one whereof containing for the most part some difference between the Protestants and Papists; it is easy to consider what a huge sea of contentions there are between them, and how great a labour it must be before a man can resolve himself that will go through the same.

Thomas Waldensis.

Cardinal Bellarmine's three volumes of Controversies.

10. I was told also that the Council of Trent,* and

* Concilium Tridentinum, et ejusdem Catechismus.

the Catechism set forth by order thereof, entitled "Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos, &c." would help me much to see what Catholics indeed do hold in their assertions, and what is wrongfully imposed upon them; for whatsoever is there set down is received and admitted commonly by them all; for which cause I took a particular note of these books above the rest for furnishing of my search, and for my better direction for examining indifferently both sides.

11. But now for Protestant books,* though I had the same desire to peruse such as were admitted and followed by all, yet that was not so easy to discern and find

The difficulty to find any Protestant book that all do follow.

out. For that hardly I supposed that any one book can be found whom all Protestants do admit generally. "The Confession of Augsburg," together with the Apology thereof written by Philip Melancthon, is followed, as I understand, by most Lutherans, but not by our Church of England; Mr. Calvin's four books of Institutions before mentioned are most commonly received by those that follow him, and therefore are called Calvinists, but not, I think, in all points. But yet for that to our purpose of England they are the most received books, I purposed principally to rely upon them, and to read them over again with more diligence than I had done before. And for that the

The "Apology of the Church of England."

"Apology of the Church of England," together with the Defence thereof, written by Mr. Jewell, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, seemed to be the most universal and fundamental book which our church had in the English tongue, I thought best to join that also with Mr. Calvin's Institutions, and so afterward other Protestant writers of inferior sort, as they should come unto my hands; and all this I resolved upon for better satisfaction of myself in the points before rehearsed.

* Confessio August.

CHAPTER II.

by occasion of seeking out the foresaid Books, I happened also upon others that gave me much light in divers matters, though with more trouble of mind than before; especially about Martin Luther's Conference with the Devil.

Now, being in the search after these books and others that I desired, amongst viewing of many, I upon sundry German writers—as Luther, Zuinglius, and others—which afterward I shall name, by which occasion this thought came to my mind: that forso much as I did not procure satisfaction from my Lord of Canterbury and his doctors, in the particular doubts I had about Luther, Zuinglius, and Calvin, the first preachers and publishers of the Protestant doctrine in this our age, it should be amiss to satisfy myself somewhat by reading and viewing the places in their works which are alleged in

“Defence of the Censure.” And so for that the occasion of the devil's suggestion, both to Martin Luther for writing the mass and other articles of the Roman religion, and to Zuinglius for rejecting the real presence, did stick in my mind, and caused some horror to think that in England should follow a doctrine revealed by the Devil himself, I was very desirous to read the story at length in Luther himself, and so much the more for that Cowham had not that book of Luther wherein this matter was contained when I conferred with him. And with Mr. Dr. Covell I had some little sight thereof, but such as did fully satisfy me. Wherefore I sought out Luther's works, and the book “De Missa Angulari, et de consecratione Sacerdotum,” or, as others entitle it, “De Sacramente Privata, et Unctione Sacerdotum;” and, for more

certainly, I sought two editions of his works, the one of Wittemberg, tom. vii., the other of Jena, tom. vi., in which book is recounted, at large, the conference, or rather large dispute, which Luther saith that he had with the devil, or the devil rather with him, about the mass.

2. To omit, therefore, repetition of those things which before we have set down out of the "Defence of the Censure," he sheweth in this book * how the devil came unto him at midnight, as oftentimes he had done before, saying,

Audi (vir doctissime), nosti te quindecim annis celebrasse missas privatas, &c.—Hearken, most learned man, thou knowest that thou hast celebrated private masses for these fifteen years! Quid si missæ privatæ horrendæ sint idolatriæ? &c.—What if such private masses be horrible idolatry? What, if perchance, the true body and blood of Christ be not there (in the sacrament), but that thou hast adored only bread and wine, and offered the same to be adored by others? Whereunto, saith Luther, I answered, I am an anointed priest, and received my consecration from the bishop, and I have done all that I have done by commandment and obedience of my superior, &c. To which the devil replied, All this is true, but Turks and gentiles do also perform those things which belong to their temples out of obedience; the priests of Jeroboam, in like manner, did all their offices with certain zeal. What if thine ordination and consecration was false as the priests of Turks and Samaritans are false priests, and their manner of worship false and impious? Hic certè sudor mihi erupit, saith Luther—Here I began to sweat, and my heart to tremble; the devil knew how to put his arguments in good order to impugn me, habetque gravem et fortem vocem, &c., and he hath a grave, and strong voice. Certè in hac disputatione comprehenderat me—Truly in this disputation he caught me. Wherefore I stood attent to hear what reasons or arguments he would bring forth against my priesthood, and consecration, which were these five that do ensue.

Mr. Luther's
conference with
the devil.

Five argu-
ments of the
devil against
Mr. Luther's
priesthood.

* Cap. 2, diffic. 3, Luth. tom. vii. Wittem. anno 1558, in lib. de Missa Angulari, seu Privata, et Uctione Sacerdotum, fol. 228, and tom. ix. Geni Jenensi, fol. 28.

3. *First of all thou knowest, quoth the devil, that hitherto thou hast had no true knowledge of Christ, nor true faith; for as for thy faith, it hath been no better than the faith of any Turk: for both the Turk, yea and myself, and all the devils do believe those things that are written of Christ, as James doth testify,* that is to say, we believe how he was born, died, and ascended into heaven; but yet none of us make account of him as our Saviour, but we fear him as a most severe judge; and such is thy faith, and the faith of you all, who, leaving Christ, do run to Mary, and to saints, &c.*

Prayer to saints and chiefly to the B. V. M. as odious to the devil as to Protestants.

4. *Secondly, thou wert ordained priest, and hast consecrated contrary to the ordination and will of Christ; for Christ's will is that the sacrament, or mass, be so administered as it be given unto Christians; for that he that sacrificeth is the minister of the church to distribute sacraments, and to preach as the very words of Christ are in his supper,† and as Paul teacheth in the eleventh chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, &c. But thou, contrary to this will of Christ, hast received the sacrament alone for fifteen years, qualis sacerdos fuisti qui tibi soli, et non ecclesiæ ministrasti? de tali ordinatione profecto Christus nihil novit—What manner of priest hast thou been, which hast ministered only to thyself alone, and not to the church? Truly, Christ never knew any thing of any such ordination.*

5. *Thirdly, saith the devil, Christ will have that in presence of the sacrament there be made a sermon of him and his death, for so he saith, Do this in remembrance of me, and shew forth, as Paul speaketh, my death until I come; but thou, poor sacrificing priest, in a corner, dost not preach any word at all, nor hast thou confessed Christ in all thy corner masses, sed solus sumpsisti, solus tecum mussitasti, but thou hast received alone, and hast mumbled it up by thyself alone. Hoccine est Christi voluntati satisfacere? hoccine est verus sacerdos? hæccine est sancta ordinatio?—Is this to fulfil the will of Christ? Is this a true priest? Is this an holy ordination? &c.*

* James ii.

† Were you there, Sir?

6. *Fourthly*, saith the devil, *Christ's will is, that the sacrament be common to all, and be communicated to other Christians, but thou wert ordained to offer up unto God, nec in sacerdotem sacramenti, sed in sacerdotem oblationis ordinatus es, nor was thy ordination to make thee a priest of the sacrament, but of oblations; for so do the words sound of the bishop's suffragan, when he delivered the chalice into thine anointed hands, saying: Accipe potestatem consecrandi et offerendi pro vivis et mortuis—Receive power to consecrate, and offer for the living and dead, &c. O abominationum abominationem! O abomination of abominations! quoth the devil.*

7. *Fifthly*, saith he, *Christ's will is, as now hath been said, that the sacrament be distributed unto Christians to confirm them in their faith, and that they may publicly celebrate his praises, but thou hast made it a private work, and for thyself, and hast done all without the ministry of others, and hast applied the same to others, and sold it for money. Quid horum negare potes?—What canst thou deny of all this?*

8. And hitherto are the devil's arguments and speeches set down in his own words, as Luther himself recounteth them. And after this the said Satan repeateth again, as it were by a *compendium*, all that he had said before, adding divers things thereunto, which for prolixity I do pretermit. All which being ended, Luther writeth thus of himself:

In hac angustia, et necessitate constitutus, diabolum à me propellere volebam, &c. I being in these straits and necessity, I would have driven the devil from me, taking up the old buckler and shield, which was taught me among the Papists, to wit, that the intention and faith of the church was good, &c. But the devil resisted me, saying, *Amabo, Dic mihi quo loco scriptum sit, quòd impius et infidelis homo possit in fide, et intentione ecclesiæ consecrare?*—"Tell me, I pray thee in good fellowship, where is it written, that an ungodly and unbelieving man may consecrate in the faith and intention of the church? Where hath God taught or commanded this?" To which interrogations and

A new assault
of Satan, by
way of friendly
persuasion,
whereunto Lu-
ther did yield.

arguments of the devil, Luther, confessing that he could not answer, did yield in all points here touched by him, except in only one, which was against the *real presence*, in which, though in all the rest he did, yet could he not in this prevail with Luther, but reserved the same, as it seemeth, to persuade it some few years after to one of Luther's first and chief scholars, called Uldericke Zuinglius, who was also in great perplexity and conflict of mind about this matter in the city of Zurich, in Switzerland, where he disputed before the magistrates of that city or commonwealth to impugn the *real presence*; and the "Defence of the Censure"* saith, that Zuinglius had a like conference with the devil to help him out in that matter, as himself writeth and testifieth. And now, having commodity to see some part of his works, I was very curious to find out and read the same.

Another conference of the devil with Zuinglius about the real presence.

9. Wherefore, perusing diligently his works and falling upon a certain treatise of his, entitled "De Subsidio Eucharistiæ," of the succour he had about the eucharist, the reason of which title I shall afterward shew, I found the whole matter by himself set down at large. *Capimus ergo*, saith he, *cogitare omnia, omnia revolvere, &c.*† We began, therefore, to think upon all places of Scripture, and turn over all (to find out some place where the word (est) without any metaphor is put for significat), but no example occurred unto me, besides those which I had put down in my commentary. And if any thing did occur, it was not much different from the other, that I had set down, &c. *Cùm verò 13 Aprilis lux appeteret, when the thirteenth day of April drew near*, which was the last day to exhibit to the magistrates the proof of his opinion, *I was vehemently troubled*, saith he, *in my sleep*: *ibi ἀπὸ μηχανῆς visus est monitor adesse* (ater fuerit an albus nihil memini, somnium enim narro) qui diceret, *Quin ignave, respondeas ei, quòd Exodi xii. scribitur, Est enim Phase, hoc est, transitus Domini*: protinus ut hoc phantasmata visum est simul expergesco, et è lecto exilio, &c. *There*, saith he, *opportunately appeared one to admonish me* (*I remember not whether he*

* Page 91.

† Zuing. lib. De Subsidio Eucharist.

were white or black, for I rehearse but a dream) who said, *Thou slothful fellow, why dost thou not answer thy adversary, that it is written in the xii. of Exodus, thus: For it is the Pasche, that is to say, the passing by of the Lord: where (est) standeth for (significat). And presently, as this vision appeared unto me, I suddenly awaked, and leapt out of my bed, and went to examine the place in the Septuagint interpreters first, and looked upon all circumstances, and afterwards disputed thereof as I could before the whole multitude of people, which sermon of mine was acceptable to all professors of divinity there present, as after shall be declared.*

10. Thus far writeth Zuinglius of himself, and of the success of his disputation in Zurich against the *real presence*, which city, it seemeth, principally upon the bringing forth of this place out of Exodus, changed her opinion of the said *real presence*; whereas it appeareth that Mr. Luther took exceeding great indignation, and thereupon wrote his treatise, entitled "*Defensio Verborum Cœnæ*,"* the defence of Christ's words (*this is my body*) in his last supper. In which treatise he doth both answer the place of Exodus, shewing it to make nothing to the purpose, for that *Phase*, in that place, signifieth only the *Paschal* solemnity in remembrance of the *Passover*, and inveigheth bitterly both against Zuinglius, and the wicked spirit that appeared unto him to deceive him, concluding with these words: *Incipet te Deus, O Satan, quàm acerbè nobis illudis*—"The Lord rebuke thee, and put thee to silence, O Satan, how bitterly dost thou delude and deceive us." So he.

11. And now, having read all these things in the very authors themselves, that were the first teachers of Protestant doctrine in our age, whereat I had so much wondered before, when I first read them briefly touched in the "*Defence of the Censure*," I cannot well express how I was encumbered with this cogitation to think that they should confess of themselves that they had the very first and principal articles of their difference from Catholics (which articles are

My considerations upon the premises.

* Luth. tom. vii. f. 325 et deinceps.

also now held in England) from the suggestion of wicked Satan, for that in the narration which hitherto hath been laid forth out of their own words, the very principal points in controversy have been touched by the said spirit; as, namely, against the mass, against the ordination and consecration of priests, against the *real presence*, against private receiving and communicating about the faith of the church, about honouring and invocation of our Lady, and other saints, and some other points insinuated, as may be gathered by reading of the precedent discourse itself, but these points expressly impugned: and that which is yet more strange to me to consider here, is, that the devil alleged such arguments against Papists' religion, in favour of Protestants, [as the Protestants themselves do often urge against the Catholics,] as though he had loved the Protestant religion, and hated that of the Catholics, which they would say, is a good sign that it is the truth. And yet further I did not a little marvel, and could not choose but laugh with myself, that the said devil was so fervent and zealous for the glory of Christ, and that his will and ordination should be observed, and other such points, which I could not possibly conceive how it might stand with the nature and office of the devil to speak so earnestly for truth, and to plead for Christ's honour and observation of his institution. And I did marvel exceedingly that Luther and Zuinglius would publish such things in print, and much more that their followers would suffer them to be printed again, and set forth in divers tomes and volumes after their deaths, as now they are.

12. Moreover, whereas before I had a great aversion to believe that such a man of God as Luther, chosen to so great a work, as I persuaded myself he was, should have any familiarity or conversation at all with the devil, and thereupon could hardly believe that he should write of himself, that he knew him well, and *that he had eaten more than a bushel of salt with him*; and other such speeches recounted in the "Defence of the Censure;" now, reading over sundry parts of his works extant in print, I found many speeches of

Other speeches
of Mr. Luther
concerning the
devil.

his not much differing from the other. First, in a certain epistle of his to the Duke Elector of Saxony,* he saith, *That the devil is so about him, many times, that he can neither write nor read.* And, in another place, writing against the Sacramentaries or Zuinglians, whom in contempt he calleth Swermerans, he saith of their arguments: *Ipsorum argumenta per otium à Diabolo audiui, et graviora quidem sed per verbum Dei vici:†*—"I have heard from the devil at my leisure their arguments, yea, their chief arguments, but I overcame them by the word of God;" which seemeth to import a certain familiarity he had of reasoning and conversing with the devil at his pleasure. And this is confirmed greatly by that he saith, in the same work, fol. 281 *Diabolus frequentius et propius mihi condormit, quàm me Catharina*—"The devil," saith he, "doth oftener and nearer sleep with me than my own Catharine;" that is to say, than Mistress Catharine Boir, his wife. And fol. 272 talking of his great familiarity he had with divers devils: insomuch as he walked up and down divers times with them in his *dormitory*, he added, that he had *Unum atque alterum mirabilem Diabolum, à quibus diligenter, atque admodum intentè observetur,‡* one or two marvellous devils: by whom he was diligently and very attentively respected and attended upon: of whom he saith that his opinion was, that they were *non vulgares sed magni dæmones imò doctores theologiæ inter diabolos*,—"not common or vulgar, but great devils, yea doctors of divinity among other devils."

13. And now let any man imagine in what pligh horror, and aversion of mind I was when I read these things in Luther's writings themselves, not being able to doubt of the truth thereof, but that they were written by him. Then did I think with myself out of what spirit a man so conversant with devils could write any thing of true religion and piety; and how dangerous a point it were for a man to rely his soul

Devils said by
Mr. Luther to
be doctors of
divinity.

Mr. Luther's
licentious doc-
trine.

* Tom. v. Jenen. Germ. fol. 486.

† In Colloq. Mensal. Germ. edit. fol. 216.

‡ Fol. 281; fol. 275.

much upon him that was so beset with opposite and contrary spirits. For as the spirit of Christ cannot but persuade good things and true doctrine, so cannot the spirit of the devil but persuade to the contrary in all points, either openly or covertly. So as now I remained more perplexed than before.

CHAPTER III.

How, after the perusal of these Conferences of Mr. Luther and Mr. Zuinglius with the Devil, I passed further to examine some of their Doctrines before mentioned; and what I found confirmed thereof by themselves; as, also, the great Dissensions I discovered in Protestant Writers of different professions.

AFTER I had found out and perused his foresaid speeches and conferences with the devil, I was desirous to seek out also somewhat about those licentious and carnal doctrine of his which are mentioned in the "Defence of the Censure;" as that a man might say to his wife, *Si tu non vis, velit alia: non vult uxor, veniat ancilla, &c.*;* and I found the matter to be true that he is full of such doctrine; for in the very same place where he hath this doctrine, he saith that the words in Genesis, *Crescite et multiplicamini*, is not only a precept, but more than a precept, which no man may pretermitt or let pass; it being a thing so necessary as to eat, drink, play, spit, purge, or sleep. "For as it is not in my hand," saith he, "to make myself not to be of the masculine gender, so is it not in my power to live without a woman." And in another place I found him to have the same doctrine in these words: *As no man can want meat and drink, so is it impossible for any man to abstain from a woman, &c.*† "The cause is this," saith he; "for that we were conceived in a woman's womb; there did we grow; there were we born; from her we took our milk; by them were we brought up; so as the greater part of our flesh is of the woman; whereby it cometh to pass, that it is impossible for us to be separated from them."

* Luth. lib. de Vita Conjugali.

† Ib. in Colloq. Germ. c. de Matrim.

St. Jerome writeth much of the temptations of the flesh; but, alas! it is but a small matter; a woman dwelling in house with him would easily remedy all. Eustochium,* the virgin, would easily have holpen St. Jerome." And yet further, in another place: "As God hath seriously and severely commanded, Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, even so, and much more, hath he commanded that thou shalt take a wife; and every woman shall take a husband; and therefore," saith he, *a young maid who hath not this supreme gift of continence can no more want a man than she can live without her meat, drink, and sleep.*† And again: *Nothing is more sweet or loving upon earth than is the love of woman, if a man can obtain it.*‡ And his final conclusion is: *He that resolves to be without a woman, let him lay aside the name of a man, and make himself an angel or a spirit.* And therefore he rageth exceedingly, and crieth out against St. Jerome, because he so highly commendeth virginity as to prefer it before marriage, saying, *Quid dici potest, &c.* What can be more carnally spoken, more wickedly, sacrilegiously, and blasphemously, than that of Jerome—*Virginitas cælum, conjugium terram replet?*—"Virginity filleth heaven, and marriage filleth the earth." Thus this lewd Luther;§ which greatly misliked me.

2. And not only in these matters about marriage I observed divers doctrines and speeches of his that seemed not apostolical, or agreeing to the purity and integrity of the practice of holy men and saints in the primitive church; but divers others also, tending to plain dissolution of manners and conversation. As, for example, in a chapter of *consolation*, which he writeth in one book of his,|| he hath these words: "Mr. James, the preacher of Breame, having me with him at dinner upon Palm-Sunday, in Lent, amongst other dishes, provided me a hen, saying,

* Eustochium was a holy virgin, to whom St. Jerome did often write and dedicate some books.

† Luth. tom. ii. Wittemb. fol. 328, c. 6.

‡ Idem, in Proverbs xxxi. ver. 10, in margine.

§ Idem, tom. vii. in Epist. ad Wolfang. and fol. 505. Idem, lib. de Servo Arbitrio.

|| In Colloq. Lat. tom. ii. c. de Consolatione.

when it came to table, *Si docemus, quare non facimus?*—"If we teach (this to be lawful), wherefore do we not practise it also?" Whereupon I cast off my habit; for if I had not shaken off my hood, eaten flesh, and married a wife, the Papists would have calumniated my doctrine as not true, or not coming from my heart, for that I did not practise it." And in the same work he writeth thus of himself: *Ego vix ullam consolationem ex morte et resurrectione Christi capio, &c.**—I can scarce take any consolation out of the death and resurrection of Christ, but I can out of temporal gifts received from God; as to eat bread and drink beer, &c. All which speeches, truly, I would never have believed to have been uttered by him, if I had not read them myself in his works.

3. But now, further, I observed in his said writings a marvellous rash and careless manner of charging his adversaries (as to me it seemed) with doctrines which they hold not;† and in relating quite otherwise the state of the controversy from the truth of the matter; which inferreth that kind of falsehood and want of conscience that before I complained of. And this I discovered in almost infinite places, to my seeming; whereof some few I shall not here, for example sake. And first, whereas, in his book *de Captivitate Babylonica*, he treateth of the sacrament of penance, and whether Papists do give any place therein to faith, or no, he saith: *This our Popish Babylon hath so far extinguished faith in this sacrament, as with a shameless forehead she denieth faith to be necessary; nay, further she hath, with an antichristian impiety, defended, that it is an heresy if any man affirm faith to be necessary.*

4. The same he hath upon the 15th of St. John, and in his sixth article against the execrable bull, &c. And in another place‡ he goeth further, saying: "Do but shew me one place of the justification of faith, in *omnibus statutis synodorum, in omnibus postillis, et in toto Hieronymo et Gregorio, &c.*"—"In all the decrees of councils, or in all the postils upon them, or in all Jerome, or Gregory, &c.;" which truly made me ashamed; for when I went to exa-

* Luth. in Colloq. Lat. tom. ii. cap. de Christianis.

† L. de Captivitate Babyl.

‡ In Colloq. German., c. de Morte.

mine the authors themselves, I found, first, that the Council of Trent itself,* which all Catholics admit, in the sixth session and eighth chapter, doth expressly decree, that *fides est humanæ salutis initium, fundamentum, et radix omnis justificationis; sine qua impossibile est placere Deo, et ad filiorum ejus consortium pervenire*—"Faith is the beginning and foundation of man's salvation, and the root of all justification; without which it is impossible to please God, or to attain to the society of his children." And the catechism of the same council, speaking of this very matter of penance, and disposition thereby to justification, saith: *In eo quem pœnitet, fides pœnitentiam antecedit necesse est, &c.*†—"In him which doth repent, it is of necessity that faith go before penance." Bellarmine, also, in his first book *de Pœnitentia*, c. 2, doth prove the matter at large, that never Catholic held otherwise; but that faith is chiefly, and in the first place, required to true penance; affirming that these are most malicious impostures and calumniations of Luther. And moreover, another principal writer of the Roman faith,‡ in our days, doth allege about thirty fathers and doctors of the Greek Church, and six-and-fifty of the Latin Church, whose very words he citeth, agreeing together in this doctrine that faith is necessary unto justification; and among them he allegeth sundry plain testimonies out of St. Jerome and St. Gregory in particular, expressly affirming the same in divers places of their works; whereas Luther denied any one word to be found in them, throughout their works, of that point.

5. Which when I considered, I thought with myself how great a perversity this was in Luther to affirm so resolutely the contrary, and that, by this means, a man cannot tell what to believe. For I saw that, albeit this false assertion of Luther be so manifest, as we have shewed it, and he could not but know it, yet, being once published, it was taken up presently, and published again by others,

* Conc. Tri. sess. 6, c. 8.

† Catech. ad Paroch. de Pœn. Sacramento, n. 8.

‡ Jacobus Cœccius, tom. ii. Thesauri, l. 3, art. 1.

and so continued from hand to hand unto this day. They also that write and avouch the same after Luther cannot but know that the same is false; as, namely, Philip Melancthon,* one of Luther's principal scholars, in many places of his works, as now I perceived, teacheth the same, and, namely, in his "Disputations about Penance," saying: *Stultè et impiè docuerunt scholastici, peccata remitti per contritionem sine fide*—"The school doctors have foolishly and wickedly taught that sins are forgiven by contrition without faith;" whereas, so far as I can perceive or learn, no one school doctor did ever affirm it, but the quite contrary. So then what a grievous sin is this, thought I, to lie so manifestly in so great and principal an article of our faith; and further, I thought with myself, that if but one man should be deceived with such a lie, it were, no doubt, a great offence to Almighty God; and then I imagined how many thousands might be, and are, no doubt, at this day, in all Saxony, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and other countries where the Lutheran religion is admitted, most of which people, perhaps, upon this false principle taught them by Mr. Luther, Melancthon, and such other principal men of that profession, that Papists require no faith in the justification of a sinner, but do rather reject it, and do hold it for heresy to think it needful, were moved first or principally to leave their old religion and admit that of Luther.†

6. And with these cogitations was I troubled in reading these places of Luther, where also I found many other things, as manifestly false, concerning other articles, as this: and, namely, talking of the grace of God and necessity thereof to all good works, he saith: *Papistæ docent posse hominem propriis naturæ viribus, sine gratia Dei, mandata servare* ‡—"The Papists do teach that a man may keep the commandments of God, with the proper forces of nature, without God's grace." But this I found to be contradicted manifestly, and by all Papists commonly; as,

* Melanct. Disp. de Poenitentia, Prop. 7.

† Luth. ad lib. Ducis Georgii Saxonie, script. anno 1533.

‡ L. i. de Natura Hominis, art. 4.

namely, by Bellarmine at large, *lib. 5, de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, cap. 4 et 5,** and by the foresaid author Coccius, where he setteth down this article: *that, after the fall of Adam, no man can do any good thing, by the proper forces of nature, but hath need always of the help of God's grace.* And besides all Scriptures alleged for the same, he citeth above a hundred Greek and Latin Catholic writers that confirm the same.

7. I read further in Luther these words: *Nomen liberi arbitrii odiosissimum fuit omnibus patribus, &c.†*—"The name of free will was most odious to all the ancient fathers;" which seemed to me a more strange assertion than any of the former. For so much as no one thing is so frequent with all the fathers as this: that man hath free will (though standing in need of God's grace); insomuch as fully St. Augustine, both in his books, as well *de Libero Arbitrio*, as *de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, and all those which he wrote against the Manichees that denied *free will*, may be a sufficient refutation thereof, without other witnesses. And in one place he hath these significant words:

Deo hoc est manifestum, ut nulla doctorum paucitas, illa indoctorum turba dissentiat.‡ This thing is so manifest (to wit, that man hath free will) that no small number

learned, nor any multitude of unlearned men did ever disagree therein. And in another place: *Est igitur verum arbitrium*, saith he, *quod quisquis esse negaverit, catholicus non est*—"There is free will therefore, which whosoever denieth, he is no Catholic." Let any man read Bellarmine, and he shall see all antiquity conspiring in this point. And the foresaid Coccius allegeth sixty-six Greek fathers and ninety-five of the Latin church, five principal of the Jewish synagogue, by many large testimonies confirming the same.§ So as I marvel in what sense Mr. Luther could verify his asseveration.

8. As in like manner, where he writeth injuriously of the famous doctor, St. Jerome, *that he may be read for*

* Tom. ii. Thesauri.

† Luth. in Colloq. Latin. c. de Libero Arbitrio.

‡ August. l. de vera Religione, c. 14, et l. de Gra. et Lib. Arbit. c. 2.

§ Luth. in Col. Germ. cap. de Scriptis Patrum, item in Col. Latin. cap. de Patrib. t. ii.

history, but as for faith and true religion, there is not one word to be found thereof in his writings. And again: Jerome doth treat indeed of Christ, but only in name: but of faith, hope, and charity, he saith nothing at all. Wherefore Staupitius, a diligent reader of his, saith of him, I would gladly know how Jerome can be saved. These words of Mr. Luther seemed unto me too slanderous against so ancient and holy a father, and that they could not proceed from a good conscience; as neither these which he writeth of original sin: *Peccati originalis usque ad Augustinum nullus patrum mentionem fecit*.* Of original sin, saith he, no one father made mention till Augustine. Whereas Bellarmine doth allege eighteen several fathers that made mention of that matter before St. Augustine, and he is the nineteenth. And Coccius citeth fifteen Greek fathers and sixteen Latin before St. Augustine, which make one and thirty.† And so in this I see not how Mr. Luther can any way be defended. And, truly, it is strange, as before I have noted, that such things should be either uttered by such a man, or continued after in print by his followers; as are also these other his assertions concerning the Papists: *Papistæ*, saith he, *hodie planè non credunt animæ immortalitatem*‡—"The Papists, at his day, do not believe at all the immortality of the soul." And again, in another place, he writeth thus: *In the Lateran council, that was celebrated in the year 1515, in the time of Pope Julius, it was first of all known and decreed, that the resurrection of the dead was to be believed*.§ And will any man of reason believe this? Surely, I confess, that herewith I lost a great part of my belief and credit to Luther's words and assertions. For it seemed to me impossible that he should write of a good conscience that durst set down in print so manifest falsities, having neither show nor probability of truth.

* Luth. in Colloq. Latin. cap. de Adulter.

† Bellar. de amiss. gratiæ, l. 4, c. 5. Coccius, Thes. l. 2, art. 2.

‡ Luth. lib. cont. Amb. Cathar. Luth. in Colloq. Germ. cap. de Antichristo.

§ Vide diffic. 8, pp. 19, 20, 21, 22, and Defence of the Censure, pp. 72, 73, 74, 75; Cont. art. Lovan. Thes. 27; In Colloq. Lat. tom. ii. cap. de Adult. ibid. tom. i. c. de Damnatis in Inferno. L. de cœn. tom. ii. Germ. fol. 182.

9. And yet, being now in his works, I was desirous to see as much as I might, for the straitness of time, of some other points before touched out of the "Defence of the Censure," and Mr. Charke's Reply; as, namely, about the brotherhood that is between Luther and those whom he calleth Sacramentary heretics; for that Mr. Charke, in his Reply, saith *that in the principal points of faith they agree and are brethren*; whereabout first I found out those places of Luther alleged by the Censure, and Defence thereof, where Luther giveth this sentence of Zuinglians and Calvinists, saying: *Hæreticos seriò censemus, et alienos ab ecclesia Dei, &c.*—"We do seriously censure them for heretics and aliens from the church of God." As also he affirmeth, that their first author, Zuinglius, *latro mortuus est*, died a thief, and, in his judgment, was damned; which judgment, he saith, *Christ doth command us to pronounce upon such as deny him in this life, as Zuinglius did* (in denying the real presence), of whom he saith further, *that he held him not in number of Christians, quia totum Christum amiserat, for that* (thereby) *he had lost Christ altogether*,* which made me tremble, that had always held the same opinion. And furthermore, he said, that he held his books and doctrine for nothing else, but for *venenum tartarei dæmonis*, "the poison of the devil of hell;" and that he would never have more conversation either with him, or with those of his sect.

10. [And of this the Zuinglians and Calvinists themselves do highly complain, in a treatise which they wrote against Luther, in these words: *Nos condemnatam et execrabilem vocat sectam, &c.*—"Luther calleth us a damnable and execrable sect, but let him look that he do not declare himself an archheretic, seeing he will not, or cannot, have any society with those that confess Christ. But how marvellously doth Luther here bewray himself with his devils, what filthy words doth he use, and such as are replenished with all the devils in hell! for he saith, 'that the devil dwelleth both now and ever in Zuinglius, and that they have a blasphemous breast, in-satanised, super-

Any man may see what a devilish spirit guided both parties, and that all these heretics are in-satanised, super-satanised, &c.

* Ibid. tom. iii. Ger. fol. 264.

satanised, and per-satanised, and that they have besides a most vain mouth, whereof Satan beareth rule, being infused, perfused, and transfused into the same.' Did ever any man hear such speeches come from a furious devil himself?" Thus they. And their chief patriarch Zuinglius condemneth him also for adulterating the word of God, saying: *Tu Luthere, &c.**—"Thou, Luther, dost corrupt and adulterate the word of God, following herein the Marcionists and Arians, who of old were wont to raze out of the Scriptures such places as seemed to be against their doctrine." So he.]

11. Now as for the agreement mentioned by Mr. Charke, to wit, that they (the Protestants) do all agree in the principal articles of belief, I could not possibly devise how the same could stand either with that eagerness and bitter writing of Luther against all Sacramentaries, as he calleth us of England, or with the assertions of many other books that I fell upon, both of Zuinglians and Lutherans. For of the first, I found in a certain preface of the divines of Zurich, placed before the "Apology" of their Zuinglian doctrine, directed to the reformed churches, these words: *Nec de sola Cæna Domini, &c.†*—"Our controversy (with the Lutherans) is not only about the *Supper of our Lord*, but about the person also of Christ, the union and distinction of his divine and human nature, the presence of his body, of eating his flesh, of his ascension into heaven, and sitting at the right hand of his father; about which points, while we stand disputing in heat and fervour, many old heresies, damned by our ancestors, being called from hell, lift up their heads again." Thus say these Protestant doctors. Now if these points be not principal and fundamental in Christian religion, I know not what are to be accounted principal or fundamental. And this also brought me into greater perplexity.

12. Moreover, lighting upon the books of Francisc Stancarus,‡ a famous Protestant preacher in Polonia, found in one, particularly written against Calvin himse

* Zuinglius, tom. ii. ad Luther. de Sac. fol. 412.

† Theol. Tigur. in præfat. Apologet. ad Reform. Eccles. anno 1578—

‡ Stancarus, lib. contra Calvin. n. 4.

these words: "*Cave Christiane Lector, &c.* Beware, Christian reader, of the book of Calvin, especially in the articles about the blessed Trinity, incarnation of Christ, and his mediation, about the sacrament of baptism, and predestination:" *Continent enim doctrinam impiam, et blasphemias Arianas*—"for that they contain impious doctrine, and Arian blasphemies:" [and, as concerning his corrupting of the very text of Holy Scripture, you shall hear what another saith: *Calvinus in sua Harmonia* (saith he), *textum evangelicum desultare facit sursum versum, ut res ipsa indicat; vim insert litteræ evangelicæ, et illam in multis locis transponit, et insuper addit litteræ*—"Calvin, in his commentary called the 'Harmony,' maketh the text of the Gospel to leap up and down, as the thing itself sheweth; he offereth violence to the text of Scripture, and moreover addeth more of his own to the letter or text."]

13. Another famous Protestant writer of the Lutheran party, Conradus Schlussemburgius,* writeth thus: "Albeit," saith he, "in the beginning the controversy of the Sacramentaries was only about one article; yet, by their naughty disputations, the Calvinists are passed now so far as they have brought into doubt no small number of chief articles of Christian faith:† for now is the contention between us and them of the *omnipotency of God, of the union personal of two natures in Christ, de communicatione idiomatum, of the communication of names in the blessed Trinity, of the glorious body of Christ, of his ascension into heaven, of the difference of sacraments of the Old and New Testament, of the force and efficacy of baptism, of the prerogative of infants born of infidels, of the supper of our Lord, of predestination*, and such other, which no pious and learned man, skilful in the points of Christian religion, will ever say that they are not great controversies and articles of religion. And, for my part, I do freely profess that I do condemn their doctrine in all the fore-said articles." Thus wrote Doctor Conradus. And it were tedious to relate all that I found in this kind: for among

Difference of
doctrines be-
tween the fol-
lowers of Lu-
ther and Cal-
vin.

* Conradus de Theol. Calvin. l. 1, art. 28.

† Idem, in Præfat. Apolog. pro lib. Concordiæ.

other books, I happened upon one of Samuel Huberinus whose title was *Antithesis Lutheranae et Calvinisticae Doctrinae præcipuis Fidei Articulis*—"The Contradiction or Contrariety between Lutheran and Calvinian Doctrine the principal Articles of Faith;" and yet was he a zealous Protestant, and his book, being large and in quarto, was printed in the year 1591.

14. This then did cause me to marvel exceedingly, first that the former Protestant author, Conradus,† hath written three whole books principally to prove this point, that the Lutherans and Sacramentaries, but especially Calvinists (as he calleth them), are irreconcilable in the very chief controversies of religion. And, in his second book in the thirteenth article, he hath these words: *Nos negamus, inter nos et Calvinistas in doctrinae fundamento esse consensum*—"We deny that there is betwixt us, and Calvinists, any consent or agreement in fundamental points of doctrine." And he allegeth to the same effect the words of Beza himself. And further, in the very title of the book, he affirmeth his chief purpose to be to demonstrate to the eye, as in a table, that the Calvinists (*de nulla ferè Christianæ fidei articulo rectè sentiunt*)—"have no right faith almost in any one article of Christian religion."

15. And another famous doctor also writeth of this sect of the Calvinists, and their doctrine, thus: *Sententia quædam est, &c.‡*—"It is a certain sink into which all other heresies do flow; it is the last rage of the devil, which he in his fury, doth exercise against Christ and his church." And yet further, *Qui partes eorum sequitur*—"he that followeth that sect is a manifest and sworn enemy of God, and hath denied his faith which he promised to Christ in his baptism."§ Thus these principal and learned Protestants do everywhere express their deadly hatred and detestation of Calvin, with all Calvinists that follow his doctrine, as being most damnable and pernicious; and, therefore, Martin Luther, in an epistle to a dear friend of his the same year he died, wrote thus: *Mihi satis est omnino*

* Samuel Huberinus in *Antith.*

† Conrad. l. 3 de *Theol. Calv.* an. 13.

‡ Joan. Schutz, in lib. 50, *Causarum*, in *prefat.*

§ Idem, in eodem, l. 9, 3.

infelicissimo una ista beatitudo. Beatus vir qui non abiit in concilio Sacramentariorum, nec stetit in via Zuinglianorum, nec in cathedra Tigurinorum. Habes quid sentiam—"It is sufficient for me, of all men most unhappy, that I die with this one blessing. Blessed is the man that hath not gone in council of the Sacramentaries, nor stood in the way of Zuinglians, nor sitten in the chair of the Tigrines (to wit, by teaching or approving the Sacramentary doctrine), and thus you understand what my judgment and opinion is."

16. All which, when I had read and pondered with myself, and remembered also the common saying of all our English ministers to be, that the doctrine of the Church of England doth not disagree in substantial and fundamental points from that of the Lutherans and Zuinglians in Germany, it amazed me greatly to think what certainty I might have in points of religion, forsomuch as these were great and learned doctors also of the Protestant profession, that write and defend these points contrary to ours of England, and do hold us for heretics and men out of the way, in most chief points of faith belonging to salvation, as now you have heard. And, therefore, I found myself every day in more perplexity than other, not knowing which way substantially to resolve myself; but yet determined to prosecute this search with hope to find afterward more light for my better choice.

CHAPTER IV.

What I found in the same Protestant Authors concerning Mr. Calvin and Mr. Beza, and their manner of proceeding. And what I observed of myself in perusing Mr. Calvin's words concerning the point in hand of Untrue Dealing, False Accusations, &c.

As one great part of my former doubts and difficulties did arise upon that which the "Defence of the Censure" had cited out of sundry authors, concerning the life and manner of proceeding of Mr. Calvin, and Mr. Beza, the chief authentical doctors of our present English religion, wherein I had desired to have satisfaction from my lord, and his doctors, as before you have heard; so now finding myself not to have received the same, and falling into this commodity, which I have signified (by occasion of a reasonable good library), to view sundry foreign Protestant writers, I thought best to seek somewhat my own satisfaction in that point, by perusing what they write, and say of both these men, which I found to be such, as, in truth, I am ashamed to relate the same. For as Luther himself doth write so opprobriously of Zuin-
 Protestant doctors writing against Mr. Calvin. glius (from whom Mr. Calvin took his doctrine of the sacrament) as in the precedent chapters hath been seen; so other great and famous learned men of the Protestant profession do write as bad, or worse, both of Mr. Calvin and Beza, whose names and persons heretofore I had greatly revered. I have alleged before somewhat out of the writings of Dr. Giles Hunnius,* reader of divinity, concerning Mr. Calvin's perverse interpretation of Scripture.

2. And much more might I allege of this kind; for that

* Supra, c. 10.

another famous doctor of the same religion writeth thus: *Quis diabolus, O Calvine, te seduxit contra Filium Dei cum Ario loqui?**—"What devil, O Calvin, did seduce thee to speak opprobriously with Arius (*the heretic*) against the Son of God?" And another doctor and preacher, no less famous than he, protesteth, in a public book of his, that both Calvin and his followers are *blasphema et sacrilega secta contra Testamentum Filii Dei*†—"a blasphemous and sacrilegious sect against the Testament of the Son of God." I let pass many books which I found to be written by Protestant authors expressly against Mr. Calvin, Mr. Beza, and their doctrine; as the book of Dr. Holder, entitled *Calvinianus Candor*—"The Calvinian Sincerity"—directly written against the untruths of them both. Another also, entitled *Cuculus Calvinisticus*—"The Calvinian Cuckoo;" and the third, *Prodromus Labyrinthi Sacramentarii, &c.*—"The Guide for the Sacramentary Labyrinth." The other also, of Dr. Joannes Modestus, entitled, "A Demonstration out of the Holy Scriptures that Sacramentaries are not Christians." And, finally, to premit others, the book of Dr. Huberinus, printed at Wittemberg, upon the year 1593, in 4to., did trouble me much, whose title was, *Demonstratio Fallaciarum Joannis Calvini*—"A Demonstration of the Fallacies (*or deceits*) of John Calvin;" which, coming near to the point we have in hand, yielded unto me so many examples for proof of his false dealing, as I needed not to seek further; and to recite them in this place, were to make a new book; yet shall I touch some few afterward, that did principally concern the Papists, for that this is my purpose in this place.

3. I do premit what the said sort of Protestant doctors do write further in reproach of the life and actions of these two famous men; for concerning Beza's works and writings, that principal Protestant above named (Conradus), citing a book of his about the sacrament, writeth thus: *Beza, in obscena sua creophagia, quam haud dubiè*

* Franciscus Stancar, l. contra Calvinum, num. 4.

† Tilmannus Heshusius, in Defens. contra Calvin.

*dictante diabolo, contra Filii Dei Testamentum concinnavit, fol. 17, audacter pronunciat, Nos nihil amplius in cœna Domini ponere posse, quàm Calvinistæ ponunt**—“Beza, in his filthy book against flesh-eating (in the sacrament), which, no doubt, but the devil did dictate unto him, against the Testament of the Son of God, doth audaciously pronounce, in the 17th leaf thereof, that we (of the Lutheran sect) can put no more in the supper of our Lord than Calvinists do put,” &c. And then again, afterward: *Has sathanicas blasphemias, velut incarnatus diabolus evomuit (horresco referens), candidæ suæ quondam concubinæ sibi meretriculæ pudendis, &c.*† I am ashamed to recite it further, or to English it, and so let it pass. And another of the forenamed doctors (Heshusius), writing of the same Beza, saith thus: *Quis putasset hominem tam perfrectæ frontis, &c.*‡—“Who would ever have thought any man in the world to have been born so impudent as to set out to the world his own filthy and sacrilegious adulteries, fornications, and worse sins, whereby so polluted a beast is made a shame to all honesty and honest men?” So he.§

4. Wherefore, being weary of going forward in this argument, I left off the reading of those books, and turned myself to make some reflection upon certain observations of my own gathering, which I had made out of Mr. Calvin's “Institutions,” as they lie in order, concerning the matter now in hand, of deceitful and untrue dealing. But yet, first, I must not let pass one example that I observed in his “Harmony upon the Gospels,” where he, writing upon the fourth chapter of St. Matthew,|| concerning the forty days' fast of our Saviour Christ in the wilderness (unto the imitation whereof the whole consent of ancient fathers do say, commonly, that the fast of Lent was instituted, and observed generally in the church from

* Conrad. Schlüsselburgius, l. 2, de Theolog. Calvin.

† Conrad. ib.

‡ Tilmannus Heshusius, l. Veræ et Sanæ Confess. &c.

§ [FIRST EDITION:—And every man may easily imagine how the reading of these things did perplex me. For I could never have imagined that one sort of Protestants did write thus of another, being held by us in England to be our brethren, and of the same church, and both professing the Gospel and perfection thereof in their doctrine, and behaviour.]

|| Calv. in Matt.

the apostles' time downward), he first affirmeth that that fast of Christ was not the exercise of any virtue of abstinence in him; for that Christ, as he saith, suffered no hunger at all; and, secondly, that it was *mera stultitia* (mere folly), to use his words, for the said fathers thereon to institute the Lent fast; which speech of his sounded very harshly in my ears. And, thirdly (going yet further), he saith that it is *insana audacia* (a mad and furious audacity) in Papists to affect to do the same thing that Christ did, and that, *propria virtute* (by their own virtue). Wherein it seemed to me that, besides the injury offered to the humanity of Christ (as though it could not suffer hunger), and the condemning of the whole rank of ancient fathers, from the apostles' time, for observing the Lent fast, he uttered in his third point two things that can hardly be excused from manifest and wilful untruths:—first, that Papists do affect to perform the same thing which Christ our Saviour did in his fast; which all men see to be false; for that Christ's fast was such during those forty days, as he did not eat any thing at all; but the Papists (as I had heard), in their Lenten fast, do allow themselves every day one good meal at the least. And, secondly, it is no less notorious, by the said Catholics' doctrine, before set down, that they pretend not to perform this fast *virtute sua* (by their own strength and virtue), but by the strength of God's grace, as in the precedent chapter you have heard them to protest; teaching expressly, out of the Council of Trent,* that no good work or thought can be performed by them without the assistance of the said grace, both antecedent and concurrent. Whereupon it seemed to me impossible to clear Mr. Calvin, in this place, of wilful and witting untrue dealing. But now I pass to some other observations of mine, out of Mr. Calvin's fifth book, entitled, "Of Christian Institutions,"† which I had, as well in Latin, as in English, of Mr. Norton's translation.

5. And, first of all, I fell upon a place in his first book of "Institutions," where he writeth resolutely, that in the

Mr. Calvin's
exposition of
Christ's fast
much misliked
me.

* Concil. Trident. sess. 6, c. 16.

† Calv. lib. 1, Institut. cap. 11.

Mr. Calvin's
denial of the
use of images
of 500 years
next after
Christ.

first five hundred years after Christ there were never any images in Christian churches; which for that I have often read, and, as well myself as other ministers, had often alleged the same as a certain truth, to such as know less than we; and, on the other side, I had heard that the Papists laughed at us for it, and pretended to allege many witnesses to the contrary, even of those that lived within the said 500 years, I began to think earnestly with myself whether the truth of this assertion of Mr. Calvin could substantially and really be maintained indeed, or no; and so, going to such Catholic authors as had written purposely of that matter, as Dr. Sanders, Gabriel Vasquez, Bellarmine, and Coccius, I found them to allege many learned fathers that lived and wrote within that compass of 500 years next after Christ, affirming and testifying the use of images in Christian churches of those ages; and the last-mentioned, to wit, Coccius, citeth the words of one-and-twenty witnesses, which I going to examine, and finding them truly cited in such as I examined, I knew not what possibly to answer for Mr. Calvin; for to think that he was ignorant of all these authorities of ancient fathers when he wrote his assertion, seemed too base a conceit for me to have of him; and, on the contrary, to think that he knew of them, and yet wrote as he did, were far worse. Here, then, I hanged in great doubtfulness and perplexity.

6. The second place that, in my passage over Mr. Calvin, I made reflection upon, in his said "Institutions," as somewhat notorious in this kind, was in the relating of certain words of St. Augustine about *free-will*, wholly perverting both the words and the sense, in my conceit. The very true words of St. Augustine are these: *Prima libertas voluntatis erat posse non peccare, novissima erit multò major, non posse peccare. Prima immortalitas, &c.**—"The first liberty (of our first parents in paradise) was, to be able not to sin; but the last liberty (of the blessed in heaven) shall be much greater, to wit, not to be able to sin at all. The first immortality was, to be able not to die; but the

* Aug. l. de Corr. et Gratia ad Valent. cap. 12, et l. 22, de Civit. Dei, c. 30.

last shall be much greater—not to be able to die at all. The first power of perseverance was, to be able not to forsake that which is good ; but our last felicity shall be, not to be able to lose our perseverance at all.” These are St. Augustine’s true words, which Calvin, though he say, *I will relate St. Augustine in his own words*, yet doth he so relate the matter, as he seemeth to me to pervert both the words and sense of St. Augustine ; for thus he maketh him to speak : *Primam fuisse libertatem posse non peccare ; nostram multò majorem, non posse peccare* *—“ The first liberty (of our parents in paradise) was, to be able not to sin ; but ours is much more—not to be able to sin at all.” In which words he maketh St. Augustine to say, with the Manichees, that men, in this life, cannot sin at all (they meaning their own elect) ; which St. Augustine saith not ; but rather, expressly sheweth that he meaneth of the life to come, in heaven ; and so do the words of *novissima, immortalitas, felicitas, and erit*, import. And yet, notwithstanding, Mr. Calvin standeth so resolutely in this, as, in the same place, and next ensuing lines, he reprehendeth grievously Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, for drawing perversely (as he saith) St. Augustine’s words, sense, and meaning, to the life to come. This place did trouble me much ; for, after much beating of my wits, I could find no shift or evasion how to excuse Mr. Calvin from voluntary wresting and corrupting St. Augustine ; forsomuch as, in place of *novissima libertas*, he maketh St. Augustine to say *nostra libertas* ; changeth *erit* into *est* ; leaveth out *immortalitas* and *felicitas*, which do follow in St. Augustine, and make the matter plain ; and yet doth sharply reprehend Peter Lombard for understanding St. Augustine in his true meaning of the life to come. All which, seemed that it could hardly proceed from true and sincere mind, or from one that meant to deal plainly.

7. And for that we have here mentioned Peter Lombard, I may not premit a place or two more in the same book, where Mr. Calvin seemeth to me to use but hard measure towards him. For, first, talking of the subject

* Calv. 1. 2, Institut. c. 3, sect. 13.

Another egregious abuse offered to St. Augustine by Mr. Calvin.

Peter Lombard
abused about
original sin.

or seat of *original sin* in man, he accuseth Peter Lombard of *crassa inscitia* (gross ignorance); for that he placeth the same, as Mr. Calvin saith, in the flesh, as in its proper subject; and, consequently, not in our soul;* which I, going about to examine in Peter Lombard's words and whole discourse about that matter, I found no such thing; but rather the quite contrary, and this throughout three or four whole paragraphs which he writeth of this matter.† For though he prove, out of St. Augustine and St. Ambrose,‡ that our corrupted flesh, taken from our parents, is the cause of original sin in us, yet this is not *culpa*, *sed pena*, in the flesh, as Peter Lombard's words are; that is to say, this corruption of our flesh is not the sin itself, but the punishment of original sin; the fault or guilt of sin itself being contracted in the soul, by or through the corruption of the flesh. And the said Peter Lombard, for more explication of himself, hath this general conclusion: *Quia culpa non est in re irrationali* (because the fault or guilt of sin is not in any unreasonable thing); and then, yet further, he expoundeth himself thus: *Dicitur manere in carne, non quin in anima sit; sed quia per corruptionem carnis in anima sit*—"Original sin is said to remain in the flesh; not that it is not in the soul, but for that, by the corruption of the flesh, it is in the soul." Which doctrine, forsomuch as Peter Lombard setteth down, out of the two fathers before mentioned, to wit, St. Augustine and St. Ambrose, the oversight of Mr. Calvin seemed the greater to me, both in that he would charge him falsely, affirming him to say that which, indeed, he saith not—that *original sin is in the flesh*; as also condemning in him the doctrine of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, received by the church in their days.

8. His second accusation of Peter Lombard is in these words: *Pronunciat tandem Lombardus, &c.* §—"Peter Lombard doth at length pronounce, that we have not so

* Calv. l. 2, Instit. cap. 1, sect. 9.

† Pet. Lomb. l. 2, dist. 31, sect. b, c, d, e.

‡ Ambr. Comment. in c. vii. ad Rom. tom. iv.; August. Ser. de Verbis Apostol. tom. x.

§ Calv. l. 2, Instit. c. 2, sect. 6.

free will as that we are equally able to do or think good and evil; but only for that we are free from coaction of enforcement." Whereby he would infer that Peter Lombard doth grant that we are not free from necessity in doing good or evil, but only from compulsion; that is to say, that though we be not compelled to do this or that, yet we do it necessarily, and can do no otherwise. But when I examined the place in Peter Lombard himself, I found the quite contrary;* for that he doth hold expressly that man hath freedom, not only from *coaction*, but also from necessity in his works. Yea, treating also of the free-will of God himself, though he confess that he cannot do but good, yet doth he hold him to be free in his actions both in the one and in the other freedom; for that he might choose not to do the good that he doth; and, generally, he concludeth in these words: *Unde si diligenter inspiciatur, &c.* — "Wherefore, if the matter be diligently considered, free-will seemeth to be called free, for that, without coaction or necessity, we may desire or choose whatsoever, by discourse of reason, our said free-will shall determine:" so as, in this also, I must needs say, that Peter Lombard is unjustly handled by Mr. Calvin; and I was grieved to see it.

Peter Lombard
abused again
about free-will.

9. From this, passing unto the third book of Mr. Calvin's "Institutions" (for I purposed to go through them all), I found him, in his treatise *about prayer for the dead*, to deal most peremptorily against the authority of ancient holy fathers, in granting them to have been of a contrary opinion unto himself, for so many ages together, concerning their practice and devotion to pray for the dead, and yet doth so lightly cast them off, and set so little by them, as if himself alone, and his judgment and opinion, were to be preferred and believed before the common consent and belief of them all. Which truly seemed unto me to proceed from him out of an exceeding great pride and excessive arrogancy. For this he saith: *When the adversaries object against me that prayer for the dead hath been used above a*

Mr. Calvin's
boldness in
censuring and
reprehending
the ancient fa-
thers.

* Pet. Lomb. l. 2, dist. 25, sect. c, d, e.

*thousand three hundred years, I ask them again, by what word of God, revelation, or example, it hath been so used? for here they do not only want testimony of Scripture, but also the examples of holy men, that there are read, do shew no such things, &c.** [Which seemed to me a very strange and presumptuous manner of speech; for have there been no holy men, thought I, for the space of thirteen hundred years, in God's church? or may we, with any reason, think that so many holy fathers and learned doctors as have been in former ages, and by us Protestants so acknowledged, to wit, both holy and learned; yea, and now saints in heaven; as, namely, St. Gregory, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and St. Ambrose, with many others, of whose salvation I think never any man doubteth; may we, in prudence and equity, I say, imagine that so many holy men would have practised this praying for the dead, if it had been a doctrine so damnable as we Protestants esteem it in itself; and, moreover, for such in manner known unto them, if they did see and perceive (as Mr. Calvin saith) that they did hold the same without any warrant from God's word?] For so it followeth presently in him: *But the very old fathers themselves, saith he, that prayed for the dead, did see that herein they wanted both commandment of God and lawful example;†* which words of his seem to argue the said ancient fathers of great temerity and superstition, and want of true devotion; albeit he afterward seemeth willing to excuse them, saying, that the ancient fathers prayed for the dead, not with intent to help them, but to shew their own pious affection towards them, and by that means to comfort themselves. But this interpretation of the fathers' meaning, or manner of praying for the dead, seemed not to be consonant or agreeable unto their plain words and profession; for that all the Papists' books which I had read in this matter (and some of them I repaired unto upon this occasion) do allege store of fathers plainly interpreting their own meaning to the contrary; and especially St. Augustine, in divers of his works; as in his "Enchirid." c. 110; and in his books of "Confessions," l. 9, c. 13; in

* Lib. 3, Instit. c. 5, sect. 10.

† Ibid.

his book "*De Cura pro Mortuis agenda*," throughout the whole book, and others too long for me to rehearse.

[10. I will cite only one place out of his foresaid book,* written expressly concerning this matter, *de cura pro mortuis agenda* (of the care which is to be had of the dead): — *Non sunt prætermittendæ supplicationes pro spiritibus mortuorum, &c.*—"Supplication and prayers for the souls departed," saith he, "are not to be omitted, seeing the church alloweth them to be made for all persons that die in the society or unity of the Christian and Catholic faith, albeit, all their names be not always mentioned, but only in that general commemoration of all, which the Priest maketh at the altar,† to the end that such as have no father, nor mother, nor children, nor kindred, nor any friends alive, to pray for them, they might receive this help and assistance and relief from one, that is, the church, who is the pious mother of all." So St. Augustine. Wherefore I could not choose but be highly displeased at Mr. Calvin, when as he, rehearsing how St. Augustine recounteth the petition which his mother, St. Monica, made at her death, earnestly desiring to be remembered in the sacrifice of the altar, he calleth this but an *old wife's request*, which her son, saith he, *never examined according to the Scriptures*, but, after his own private affection, would have the same approved by others. This his censure, I say, of that holy doctor, St. Augustine by name, together with other ancient fathers, sounded very harsh in my ears; for how may we in equity think that these fathers would presume to set forth this doctrine of praying for the dead upon their own private fancies or affections, without all commandment or authority from Christ or his apostles? Whereas I found the general consent of them all to agree in one about this point, and their authorities alleged in great number by the Papists; and, namely, by Bellarmine; some whereof also I examined in the authors themselves; as, amongst the rest, that of St. Chrysostom, where he saith: *Non temerè ab apostolis hæc sancita fuerunt, &c.*‡—"It was not without

Mr. Calvin scoffing at St. Augustine and his holy mother, St. Monica.

* August. lib. de Cura pro Mortuis, c. 4.

† Ibid. c. 2.

‡ St. Chrysos. Hom. 69, ad Populum.

good reason ordained by the apostles that, in the dreadful mysteries (to wit, of the mass), there should commemoration be made of those that were departed, for they knew well the great benefit and utility they were to receive thereby." So St. Chrysostom, who affirming so confidently, as you see, that this doctrine was approved and commended by the apostles themselves, I began to reflect seriously upon the matter, and to think whether a man

Whether a
man should
believe one
John Calvin
or condemn so
many saints
and holy an-
cient fathers.

might, with more security, rely upon the authority of one Mr. Calvin, than upon the judgment, common practice, and belief of St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and divers other holy ancient learned fathers, that flourished in the church of God, so many hundred years ago.

So that I remained here in great perplexity what to think of this matter.]

11. In the very same third book of "Institutions" I noted this absolute and universal assertion of Mr. Calvin,* resolutely set down without exception against all Papists:

In omnibus hymnis et litanis Papistarum nullam umquam fieri Christi mentionem, &c.—"That in all the hymns and litanies of the Papists there is never any mention of Christ;" but whereas always

Mr. Calvin's
calumnies
of the Papists'
Litanies.

they pray to dead saints, the name of Christ never occurreth. Which general assertive proposition, when I considered and pondered with myself, I thought whether it were possible to be true; but then, going to their litanies, I found there at the first entrance *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison* (Lord have mercy upon us, Christ have mercy upon us). And yet further, *Fili Redemptor mundi Deus, miserere nobis*. And then: *Christe audi nos: Christe exaudi nos*. And from thence, passing to their hymns, which I sought out in their breviaries, I found them commonly made by St. Ambrose, St. Gregory, Prudentius, Sedulius, and other most ancient fathers, and still to conclude with *Gloria tibi Domine, &c.*, and all their other prayers throughout their whole service-book and missals to end still with these words: *Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum*. So as I was astonished to see so bold and general assertions of Mr. Calvin, subject to so evident and

* Lib. 3, Inst. c. 20, sect. 21.

inexcusable controlment; and it grieved me much to see it, nor could I tell which way to turn me for an excuse of a plain calumnation.

12. In the very same book and chapter, I noted that Mr. Calvin affirmeth, that in the third council of Carthage, wherein St. Augustine was present, Another calumnation. it was forbidden that we should say, *Sancte Petre, ora pro nobis*; which I, going to the council, found not to be so, but only that it was there decreed, *Quod cum altari assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio*,* that when the priest did stand at the altar, he should direct his prayer (and offer his sacrifice) to God the Father, and not to any other person of the blessed Trinity; which is far from that which Mr. Calvin inferreth thereof about *Sancte Petre, ora pro nobis*, whereof I find no mention in all that council.

13. Furthermore, in the same book, I noted that Mr. Calvin, talking of penance, writeth thus: *Turpiter ac impie definiunt, &c.*†—"The Papists do shamefully and impiously define, that daily penance must only be done for venial sin, as though they taught that for mortal, no penance were necessary, or, at leastwise, not daily penance;" which, seeming to me a hard speech, I demanded thereof a learned man of that side, who, exclaiming against the lack of shame and conscience, to use his words, of Mr. Calvin in this behalf, shewed me divers books of theirs, wherein they do evidently teach that daily sorrow and penance, is to be used by whosoever hath the guilt of mortal sin, and this much more than for venial. Nor did I see how I might defend or excuse Mr. Calvin in this point.

15. And yet further, in the same place about the same matter, he saith that the Papists, in treating of penance, talk only of the external punishment, *de interiori vero mentis renovatione, quæ veram vitæ correctionem secum trahit, mirum silentium*—"they speak not at all of the internal renovation of mind, which bringeth with it true amendment of life;" which seemed to me contrary to all that which they write in their books. And Mr. Calvin himself, within very Great rashness and inconsistency in Mr. Calvin.

* Concil. Carth. 3, can. 23.

† Calv. Instit. l. 3, c. 4, sect. 1.

few lines after, hath these words: *De contritione quidem et attritione multus apud eos sermo*—"They talk much, or have long discourses of contrition and attrition:" which seemeth quite contrary to the former, for that contrition and attrition, in the Papists' doctrine, be inward sorrows of mind, the one greater, the other lesser; yet both, in the Papists' sense, do draw with them amendment of life, when in any man they are truly found. So as this seemed to me both a false charge of Mr. Calvin against the Papists, as also a great oversight in contradicting himself.

16. And again they hold, saith Mr. Calvin, that they are reconciled once only by the grace of God, when they are baptized: *Post baptismum resurgendum esse per satisfactiones*—"But after baptism a man must rise again (from sin) by satisfactions;"* which doctrine also the Papists deny, and say that all rising from sin or reconciliation unto God, whether before or after baptism, must be by grace; and that satisfactions only are for temporal punishments after the guilt of sin is remitted by reconciliation; which very doctrine of the Catholics I found confessed, within few lines after, by Mr. Calvin himself, writing thus: "The Papists confess that the fault or guilt of sin is remitted by the mercy of God; but that guilt being remitted," they say, "there remaineth a punishment, which the justice of God requireth to be satisfied." Here, then, again I was so much gruelled as I could not well tell how to go forward or backward.

17. But to leave this part, and to pass to his fourth book of "Institutions," many things occurred unto me to be noted;† as, first, a certain liberty of speech in him to accuse more rashly Popes, and Papists, than it seemed to me could proceed either out of a considerate judgment or sincere conscience. For thus he writeth of certain Popes of our age, in the seventh chapter of this book: *Julius, forsooth, saith he, and Leo, and Clement, and Paul, shall be pillars of the Christian faith, &c.,* which never knew any other thing of Christ than that which they had learned out of Lucian's school. But what if three or four, since the whole college of cardi-

a strange impotency in accusing.

* Calv. Instit. l. 3, c. 4, sect. 29.

† Calv. l. 4, Instit. c. 7, sect. 27.

nals, seem to have gone astray? For these are the principal articles of that secret divinity that reigneth amongst them; first, that there is no God; Lucian was an Atheist. secondly, that all things that are written and taught concerning Christ, are lies and deceits; thirdly, that the doctrine of the life to come and of the last resurrection are mere fables, &c. And all this he setteth down resolutely, as you see, without citing any one author, or authority in the text or margin, but only noting these words—*the Atheism of Popes*;—which accusation, when I had read, and pondered once or twice over for the strangeness thereof, I began to think with myself: Can this be true? Or do our men speak out of conscience, and as they think? What may a man believe upon their words if they have no care what they affirm or deny?

18. Then I passed a little further down in the same chapter, and found many things alleged against Pope John XXII.; and, in particular, that he affirmed men's souls to be mortal, and to perish together with the body until the day of resurrection; and, in the margin, there was no other proof cited but these words, *Gerson that lived then*, signifying, as I took it, that both Gerson lived together with Pope John XXII.,* and affirming him also to have held that wicked opinion. But first I found, by conferring the times out of Tritemius and Villanus, that lived indeed with him, and other chroniclers, that Gerson was born above thirty years after the other's death, and that the said Gerson, in his "Paschal Sermons,"† which are only cited by such as ascribe this doctrine to Pope John, affirmeth not Pope John to have held the said impious doctrine, but only that being first a reader of divinity in France, when the question was in controversy among learned men of that time about the vision of God before the day of judgment; to wit, whether souls departing this life should see him before the day of universal judgment or not? wherein he favoured the negative opinion, both then and afterward when he was Pope, though he never made any decree thereof. And the same

Mr. Calvin's
accusation of
Pope John
XXII.

* Tritem. de Viris Illustribus. Joan. Villan. l. xi. Hist. c. 19.

† Gerson, tom. iv. in Serm. de Paschate.

opinion is expressly held by Mr. Calvin himself, in his third book of "Institutions,"* where he defendeth, that only Christ is in heaven before the said day of judgment, and that all other saints do expect *in atrio quodam*, in a certain entrance, or outward place, or court, until the day of judgment. Whereupon, I did wonder Mr. Calvin would both falsely charge Pope John with the other foul doctrine of denying the immortality of the soul, which error no man testifieth him to have held (no, not William Occham himself, who was his professed enemy in favour of the Emperor Ludovicus de Bavaria); and yet that Mr. Calvin himself should communicate with him in that other opinion, which some authors write (for all I find not agreeing in this point), that the said Pope held indeed, denying the clear vision of God to be granted to them that die before the day of judgment.

19. Moreover I found, by reading the foresaid authors,† who treat of this matter, especially the history of Joannes Villanus, and the "Extravagant," or decretory epistle of Pope Benedictus XII., that succeeded Pope John XXII., that sundry other points also touched by Mr. Calvin against Pope John were not true, as that the King of France did threaten excommunication unto him, except he recanted, and that he recanted publicly at the sound of a trumpet, and such other things, which by the history of the said Villanus then living, and by the narration of Pope Benedictus, in his "Extravagant," are convinced to be false, especially forsomuch as Joannes Villanus setteth down this said Pope John's matter of death, and words used thereat, concerning the opinion of souls and their seeing of God before the day of judgment, which he remitted wholly to the determination of the church; so as it misliked me greatly to see so many things objected, whereof I found the contrary by my own search of the authors themselves that wrote thereof.

20. In the thirteenth chapter of the said book of "Institutions"‡ I find that Mr. Calvin, talking of monastical

* Lib. 3, Instit. c. 20.

† See this handled again afterward out of Mr. Jewell, c. 9, n. 8.

‡ Calv. l. 4, c. 13, sec. 12.

life and evangelical counsels, writeth in this manner: *Nulli unquam veterum hoc in mentem venit, &c.*—"It never came into the cogitation of any of the ancient fathers to affirm that Christ did counsel any thing, but rather they all do cry with one voice, that there never was any one least word uttered by Christ that is not of necessity to be obeyed, and those things by name, which these good interpreters fondly imagine Christ to have counselled, they, without all doubt, teach every-where necessarily to be observed." Out of which words, he inferreth, that there is no state of perfection to be aspired unto, more one than other, nor any thing left us by way of counsel, but that all is commanded under precept; which how it may stand with the Scripture itself, I confess, it seemed hard for me to defend. For I remember the apostle's words, among other, talking of virginity: *I have no precept (saith he) of our Lord concerning virgins, but I give counsel, &c.*;^{*} but as for ancient fathers, which Mr. Calvin here denieth ever to have spoken or thought of such counsels, I found that the Papists do allege so many and so plain authorities out of them, as I did wonder greatly at Mr. Calvin's assertion. For Bellarmine[†] allegeth six different fathers of the Greek Church—Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Epiphanius, and Nazianzen; and of the Latin Church, upon the point, of so many more, to wit, Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory, and Augustine. But another writer[‡] allegeth seven more of the Greek Church, and five more of the Latin, and all seeming so clear, as it is imposible to defend the truth of Mr. Calvin's proposition against the impugnation of these three-and-twenty witnesses, being a matter of fact, whether they do affirm it or no. And the case is so clear, as I was confounded to behold it.

21. Lastly, then, to pretermit many other things that occurred unto me, I found in the same book and nineteenth chapter, the words of Mr. Calvin against the Papists, for esteeming, as he saith, more their chrism, or holy oil, in baptism, than water. *Præterita aqua* (saith

^{*} 1 Cor. vii.

[†] Bellar. l. 2, de Mon. cap. 12.

[‡] Coccius, tom. ii. Thesauri, l. 4.

Mr. Calvin's
speeches about
evangelical
counsels.

he) *et nullo numero habita, unum oleum in baptismo magni faciunt**—"They letting pass and esteeming nothing at all the water in baptism, do only magnify their oil or chrism;" which, after I had searched well the matter, I did not see how Mr. Calvin could either prove or defend:

A strange accusation about baptism.

forsomuch as I found the Papists to hold in their doctrine that the use of water is most absolutely necessary to the substance of baptism, and is an essential part thereof, which holy oil is not, as by experience I also observed, for that they account the baptism of us Protestants to be good and available now in England, though we do not use chrism or oil therein; yea, the Council of Trent† hath so expressly determined the matter, that none shall be rebaptized that are baptized by Protestants, whereby it is evident that the Papists do far more esteem water than oil in their baptism, quite contrary to that which Mr. Calvin affirmeth of them, that they condemn water. And, surely, I can never marvel enough, how in his conscience he could write such things so apparently untrue, and of which it must needs be presumed that he knew them to be untrue when he wrote them.

22. And albeit heretofore, when I read, and studied Mr. Calvin's works of myself, I made not any such reflection upon things, but believed all simply that he affirmed, at leastwise in matters of fact, when he avouched any thing to be spoken or not spoken, written or not written; yet now, having my mind more stirred to attention of matters on both sides, and having found, and felt a certain scent, or odour of uneven dealing used in Protestant writers, (which before I did only suspect to be in the Catholics, if any were), I did with more care and indifference examine matters, leaving one eye to each part to mark and behold what passed. And so by a little more examination, having found so much bad dealing as here hath been touched in our chief and prime writers—Luther, Calvin, and other strangers before mentioned—I began to imagine what I might find in

A resolution and preparation to read English Protestant writers of controversies.

* Calv. lib. Inst. 4, cap. 19, sect. 11.

† Council. Trid. sess. 7, can. 2 et 4.

our English writers, who either took out of these, or imitated them. Whereupon, I resolved and prepared myself with more attention, to go over some works of our chief English writers, and to observe such points as might appertain to this my purpose of seeking out the truth, especially in Mr. Jewell, and such others, as wrote in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's days, and were accounted the chief pillars of our English church for their times.

CHAPTER V.

What view I made of English Protestant Authors, especially of Mr. Jewell, for trial of this point of true, or untrue, dealing in their Writings. With a note prefixed of the chief Books which I found written on both sides, from the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign; and what matter they administered to me of consideration.

AFTER the former contemplation of observations taken out of Mr. Luther's and Mr. Calvin's works and writings, I took in hand to look into the principal writers in like manner of our own nation, which, being very many and more than I had time or commodity to peruse with any great attention, or special diligence, I thought best to help myself with the books and collections of Catholics that were written against them, perusing what was objected by them in this kind of false dealing, and examining the objections by the authors themselves, whether they were true or false. And for that in this point also, I was

My purpose
renewed of
noting only
voluntary
falschoods.

overloaden with a multitude of objected falsities, I resolved with myself to observe rigorously my former determination, which was to note none but such as were more eminent, and had such evidence of apparent untruth, and fraud in them, as the writer himself could not but know them in his conscience to be such. And for better performance thereof, I procured a certain information of all, or the most part, of the chiefest English books that I could learn to have been published from the said reign of Queen Elizabeth, which cometh now very near to the point of fifty years.

2. First, then, I began with Mr. Jewell's works, sometime Bishop of Salisbury, who was the first, or with the first, as I was told (and the editions of his books do shew

it) that began the public war of writing in controversies against the Papists, in the beginning of the forenamed queen's reign, about the year of Christ 1560. And the first onset was by certain challenges made by the said Mr. Jewell, partly in his sermons at Paul's Cross, and at the court, and partly by letters to Dr. Cole, wherein he challenged all men of the Roman religion, without exception, upon more than twenty articles, or rather pieces of articles (for so indeed they seem to be), then called into controversy. To this challenge Dr. Harding, that lately was gone over the

The beginning of mutual opposite writing in controversies among Englishmen.

Bishop Jewell.

Dr. Harding.

seas, made answer by writing: but while that was in doing, Mr. Jewell published another book, though without any name of author, entitled "The Apology of the Church of England," whereunto presently the foresaid Dr. Harding answered, calling the said answer "A Confutation of the Apology of England;" so as now Mr. Jewell had two irons in the fire at once, and Mr. Harding in like manner. Whereupon the said Mr. Jewell, within few years after, to wit, in the year 1566, set forth another great book, in folio, terming it "The Reply to Dr. Harding's Answer of his Challenge, and Articles;" which was esteemed to have been made by the joint labours of the most learned men in England, both in London and the universities.

3. This was the cause, as I understood, that those doctors also of the Roman religion, that were in banishment, divided their labours for confutation of this "Reply." For Dr. Harding himself made two "Rejoinders:" first, about one article only, which was the first; the second, answer to three. Dr. Sanders also wrote divers books against divers of those articles: as "The Rock of the Church," against the fourth; and another, of "The Real Presence," against the fifth; and a third book of "Images," against the fourteenth. Dr. Stapleton wrote his "Return of Untruths" especially against the first four articles of Mr. Jewell's. Others wrote other books of divers subjects; as, namely, Dr. Heskins's "Parliament of ancient Fathers for the Real Presence;" Dr. Pointz, of the "Real

Dr. Sanders.

Dr. Stapleton.

*Dr. Heskins.
Dr. Pointz.*

Presence," in like manner. Dr. Allen wrote one book of "Purgatory," and another of the "Authority of Priesthood;" Mr. Rastall, divers books, whereof one was entitled "Beware of Mr. Jewell;" another, "The Confutation of Mr. Jewell's Sermon at Paul's Cross;" and a third, whose title is "A Reply against a false-named Defence of the Truth;" and a fourth, "A Brief Show of the false Wares packed together in the named Apology of the Church of England." Mr. Martiall wrote a special book, "Of the Cross, and Honour due unto it," which was printed upon the year 1564, and a defence of the same afterwards against Mr. Calfhill.

4. And now, whiles this contention was in this heat, there comes forth, upon the year 1567, Mr. Jewell's "Defence of the foresaid Apology of the Church of England," acknowledging himself for the author thereof; unto which "Defence" the said Dr. Harding, the next year following, published an answer, called "The Detection of foul Errors, Lies, Corruptions, and other false Dealings of Mr. Jewell, in his Defence of the Apology," which detection, containing five several books, was the last that passed between them two. But, at the same time, came forth Mr.

Horne's book, Bishop of Winchester, in answer to Dr. Fecknam, about the "Pope's Authority," and of "Princes' Supremacy," and Dr. Stapleton's "Reply" thereunto, entitled "The Counter Blast to Mr. Horne's vain Blast," and it was divided into four several books. Then came forth the several books of Mr. No-

well, Dean of Paul's, and of Mr. Dorman, in confutation thereof. And before this, again was published Mr. Fox's "Story of Martyrs," afterward entitled by him "Acts and Monuments for the visible Deduction of the Protestant Church;" against

whom wrote in part Dr. Harpsfeild, in the "Latin Dialogues," set forth under the name of Alanus Copus, but others more abundantly afterward in English; as, namely, the book entitled "Of three Conversions, by Father Persons," and two volumes more of the same author, about the "Examen of the said Fox's

Calendar-Saints." Dr. Fulke also wrote against Dr. Allen's book of "Purgatory," which was defended by Dr. Bristow. The same doctor wrote also a book of "Motives to Catholic Religion;" and Mr. Gregory Martin, another of "False Translations and voluntary Corruptions" therein made by the Protestants.

Dr. Fulke.
Dr. Bristow.

Mr. Gregory
Martin.

5. And thus continued, as I was informed, this contention for the first twenty years after Queen Elizabeth's entrance to the crown until the year 1580, when they say the Jesuits first came into England; from which time the same combat of writing hath been renewed again, and continued. For presently, Mr. Charke and Mr. Hanmer wrote against Mr. Campian; and against them were written the "Censure" and "Defence of the Censure" (by Father Persons, as my Lord of Canterbury to me affirmed), upon the years 1581 and 1582. Dr. Whitaker, also writing against Mr. Campian's book of "Ten Reasons," both Dureus the Jesuit and Mr. William Reynolds defended the same; and the latter, in the same work, defended the translation and notes of the English Testament set forth at Rheims. Then came forth Mr. John Reynolds's book of his "Conference with Mr. Hart, anno 1584." And, within two years after, another of Mr. Thomas Bilson, warden of Winchester, against Dr. Allen's "Apology for English Seminaries and Catholics." And after that again, Mr. John d'Albinez's "Discourse," which was answered by Mr. Thomas Sparke, pastor of Blechly, of Buckinghamshire, and others.

Mr. Charke.
Mr. Hanmer.

Father Per-
sons.
Father Cam-
pian.
Dr. Whitaker.
Father Dureus.
Mr. William
Reynolds.

Dr. Bilson.

John d'Albinez.
Thomas Sparke.

6. From this time downward, unto ours, sundry have written different books and treatises, as, namely, Sir Francis Hastings's "Watchword against the Catholics in general;" for answer whereof, was written the "Wardword," by Father Persons; and then, there coming forth, both Sir Francis's own, and Mr. Sutcliffe's "Reply" for him, there appeared on the other side "A Warnword" against them both, whereunto Dr. Sutcliffe wrote another "Reply," calling it

Sir Francis
Hastings.

Dr. Sutcliffe.

“A full and round Answer;” yet did it satisfy but few, as far as ever I could hear; for that he was thought to fly difficulties in question, and so, not to answer to the purpose, as afterward I found out, though also for these and some other works of his, I find them to have been answered by N. D. E. O.; and W. R. M. William Perkins also hath written divers treatises, partly answered and partly not. Mr. Willet’s “Synopsis” and “Tetrastilon” have been likewise examined by E. O., as have likewise some of Thomas Bell’s books, as well by the said E. O. as by S. R. And about the same time came forth the “Survey of the New Religion,” by Dr. Matthew Kellison; whereunto I have heard that Mr. Sutcliffe answered, for I have not seen it, and the other replied. And to pass over the “Two-legged Fox of I. B., Minister,” and other like pamphlets, lastly came forth Sir Edward Cooke’s “Combat with the Catholic Divine,” and that of Mr. Morton with P. R. about rebellion and equivocation. And this shall suffice for a short view of such books of both sides, as, by occasion given unto me by my Lord of Canterbury’s commission to read Jewell and Harding, I was induced to seek out and peruse, for the trial of truth and falsehood, though there be many other books appertaining to this matter also, which I have not seen.

7. And now, if I should follow the vein of all these men in objecting of frauds and falsities, the one to the other, I should never make an end; for that Mr. Harding, in his epistle to the reader, prefixed before his first “Rejoinder” to Mr. Jewell’s “Reply,” upon the year 1566, hath these words: *The number of untruths uttered of Mr. Jewell’s part, noted and confuted by M. D. Sanders, by the author of the “Return of Untruths,” and by me, amounting to a thousand and odd; and yet of his six and twenty articles only five have passed our examination. Imagine then what number is like to rise of the whole work, whereas neither fear nor shame could withhold him from uttering such a huge number, &c.* So he. And many others do write the like of multitudes of

N. D. E. O.
William Perkins.

Mr. Willet.

Thomas Bell.

S. R.

Dr. Kellison.

E. B.
Sir Edward Cooke.

Abode a thousand untruths noted in Mr. Jewell in the examination of five articles.

untruths found in Mr. Jewell's writing, which are too long to be examined by me, and all of them indeed are not such, in my opinion, as do convince the point of wilful fraud or false meaning, which here only we treat of; being some of them rather material, than formal lies, which, therefore, when they do occur, I mean to pretermit wholly, and to allege only such, as are indeed presumed to be formal and essential lies, dissenting from the mind and judgment of the utterer; that is to say, that he knew them to be such when he wrote them, which, as before hath been touched, comprehendeth the true definition of an essential lie. Of which kind, for that a few may serve to convince the evil mind and meaning of him that uttereth such lies, as also the badness of his cause, obliging him, as it were, thereunto (for that no man needeth wilfully to lie in defence of a good cause), a few examples shall suffice of many objected on both sides.

OF WITTING FALSITIES OBJECTED TO MASTER JEWELL
IN PARTICULAR.

Section 1.

FIRST, then, the Catholics do object, for a great argument of false and fraudulent dealing, divers sentences of Mr. Jewell's "Challenge," before mentioned, which seemeth could not be simply and sincerely meant; as where he saith: *O Gregory! O Augustine! O Jerome! O Chrysostom! O Leo! O Dionyse! O Anaclete! O Xistus! O Paul! O Christ! if we be deceived, you have deceived us, &c.** And yet, afterward he denieth, say they, the authority of most of these fathers, when they are alleged against him. So again, when he writeth thus: *They have not one father, one doctor, one allowed example of the primitive church. I speak not this in vehemency of spirit, or heat of talk, saith he, but even as before God, by way of simplicity and truth;* whereas, notwithstanding, say they, he must needs know, even at that time, being learned, that there were many fathers, doctors, and examples to be

* Mr. Jewell, in his printed sermon, f. 41, and in his first and second answer to Dr. Coleg.

alleged to the contrary, which he himself afterward was forced to shift off by shameful evasions, as they charge him. And yet further he said : *If all the learned men that be alive be able to bring forth any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor, &c., I am content to yield and subscribe, &c.* And again saith he : *Now it standeth upon them to prove but one example to the contrary.* And yet further : *Let them shew me but one only father, one doctor, one place, one sentence, two lines, and the field is theirs ;* which the other side say must needs proceed of great hypocrisy and dissimulation of mind, with intention to deceive ; forsomuch as he, being learned, could not be ignorant of all the great multitude of fathers and doctors which, afterward, such as wrote against him produced ; and, consequently, say they, he could not but know that all these speeches of his were but counterfeit sayings, and different from his own judgment, and such formal and essential lies as here we treat of.

9. And surely, it is strange to me, neither could I, before this time, have imagined any such thing, that so universal accusations should be made by all Catholic writers against Mr. Jewell's fidelity and sincerity of proceeding, in those first beginnings of planting the Protestant religion in England ; to which effect do tend the several books before mentioned, of Mr. Harding's "Detection of Lies and False-dealing ;" Mr. Stapleton's "Return of Untruths ;" Mr. Rastall's "Beware of Mr. Jewell ;" and his other "Treatise of False Pack Wares ;" and other such books of that special argument concerning Mr. Jewell's fraudulent manner of proceeding, whereof, if the hundredth part be true which is objected, he must needs be confessed to have proceeded without any sincere conscience at all ; but only to have sought to maintain his party by right or wrong.

10. And now, even at the instant whilst I write this, there cometh to my hand the forenamed book, written against Mr. Thomas Morton, minister and chaplain, as they say, to my Lord of Canterbury, about equivocation ; which book, pretending to

Hypocrisy and
dissimulation
objected to
Mr. Jewell.

The treatise
tending to mi-
tigation.

prove, in the twelfth chapter thereof, this very point that we have in hand, to wit, that Protestant English writers do not deal in truth and sincerity, and out of conscience in their writing, but do often lie, both wittingly and willingly, for helping their cause, he setteth down divers examples thereof, beginning with Bishop Jewell, as the head and patron, in our country, after Mr. Calvin, of all that have ensued; and therefore, this said author stayeth himself somewhat more largely upon Mr. Jewell, than upon the rest, alleging divers reasons and arguments to shew that he must needs see and know the falsehood wherewith he wrote in many things, at the beginning of Protestant religion, under Queen Elizabeth; he allegeth, also, the examples of divers earnest Protestants that have been converted, and made Catholics, by reading and discovering the multiplicity of those falsehoods in Mr. Jewell's works; especially the learned preacher Mr. William Reynolds, testified by his own words at large; Mr. William Reynolds. and, finally, he citeth some seven or eight particular examples, for some taste, as he saith, of Mr. Jewell's bad conscience in that behalf; which, for that I, examining the places in Mr. Jewell, found them truly alleged by the objector, they moved me very much; and for that cause will I repeat them again in this place.

EXAMPLES OF FALSE DEALING OBJECTED AGAINST MR.
JEWELL, OUT OF THE TREATISE OF EQUIVOCATION.

Section 2.

THE first, then, is a manifest corruption of a place of St. Augustine,* as though he had affirmed the marriages of all votaries that any way had vowed continency, to be lawful, which the Catholics say he did not. His words, alleged by Mr. Jewell, stand thus: *Quapropter non possum dicere, &c.*†—"Wherefore I cannot say that women which are fallen from a better purpose (*of continency*), if they marry, that their marriage is adultery, and no marriage." So St. Augustine, who was of opinion, as now also the

* Treat. of Equivoc. cap. 12.

† Mr. Jewell, in a sermon at St. Peter's, in Oxford, in the Lent.

Church of Rome holdeth, that a simple vow only dissolveth not marriage, until it be public or solemn; but then, for the sin and unlawfulness thereof (which is the point in question), there ensue immediately* in St. Augustine these words, guilefully cut off and left out by Mr. Jewell, saith this author: *But I do not doubt at all* (saith St. Augustine) *to affirm, that the ruins and fallings away from holier chastity, which is vowed to God, are worse than adulteries.*† So as, albeit St. Augustine do not deny the marriages of such as, after a simple vow and promise only, do marry, to be true marriages (for that solemn vows only do make void marriage), yet he absolutely affirmeth that such marriages are sinful, notwithstanding, and offend God more than adulteries themselves.‡ And for that I examined this place myself very exactly in St. Augustine, I do allege it more at large, for that it troubled me greatly, appearing plainly to be clearly against the marriages of all votaries, in whose favour, notwithstanding, it was alleged by Mr. Jewell.

12. The second example is, of the wilful corruption and falsification, as the objector saith, of a history in favour of the said priests' and votaries' marriages, § taken out of Cassiodorus, Zozomenus, and Nicephorus, || about the marriage of Euppsychius, Bishop (saith Mr. Jewell) of Cesaræa, that died in martyrdom, having married a wife a little before; whereas the said authors have no mention at all that he was a bishop or priest, but rather evidently do shew that he was a lay nobleman ¶ (*patritius Cesarææ Cappadocææ*), a senator's son of that city, highly commended,

* [.....sed plane non dubitaverim dicere, lapsus et ruinas a castitate sanctiore, quæ vowedur Deo adulteriis esse peiores.]—Aug. l. de Bono Viduitatis, c. 10.

† Aug. l. de Bono Viduitatis, c. 1.

‡ See this more largely handled before, against Mr. Bell, in p. 1, c. 8, n. 12.

§ Mr. Jewell, in his Defence of the Apology of England, p. 176.

|| Cassiod. lib. 6, cap. 14; Niceph. lib. 10, Hist. c. 10; Zozom. l. 5, cap. 11.

¶ [See Alban Butler, April 9. Euphyschius's companion in martyrdom was a priest. It may be as well to quote the words of Zozomen:—*Λόγος κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον μαρτυρία τὸν βίον μετελθεῖν, Βασίλειον πρεσβύτερον τῆς ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ ἐκκλησίας, καὶ Εὐψύχιον Καισαρίᾳ Καππαδοκίᾳ εὐπατριῶν, ἐναγχος γαμετὴν ἀγόμενον, καὶ οἷον ἐτι νημφίον ὄντα.*—Rea-
ing's ed. 196.]

for that, having newly married a wife, yet refused not to forego her, and all things else of this world, for the love of Christ. So as Mr. Jewell, adding of his own that he was a bishop, and suppressing that he was *patritius*, is accused to have framed this example out of witting falsehood, especially amplifying the same so much as he doth, that it proved clearly the lawfulness of votaries' marriages.

13. The third example is, for that he writeth of St. Augustine, the monk that first converted England, thus: *He was a man (saith he) as it was judged by them that saw and knew him, neither of an apostolic spirit nor any way worthy to be called a saint, but an hypocrite and a superstitious man, cruel, bloody, and proud out of measure*;* which the author proveth not only to be a lie, but so also to have been known by the writer; for that there is no writing extant of any man that saw him and knew him alive, but only of St. Gregory,† that commendeth him exceedingly, and of St. Bede,‡ that lived not very long after him, who writeth also highly in his commendation. Who then, saith this author, are those that, living with him and knowing him, did judge him to be a bad man? Mr. Jewell citeth only in the margin Geoffrey of Monmouth,§ who lived near six hundred years after St. Augustine's days, and, consequently, could neither know him nor see him; nor yet hath he left written any such thing of him. Wherefore Mr. Jewell in this, is noted both of malice and deceit; and I do not see how possibly he may be defended, or excused herein.

14. The fourth example is,|| that he citeth one Joannes de Magistris, a canonist, to have written, in his book "*De Temperantia*," that *fornication is no sin*; whereas the true author indeed is Martinus, not Joannes de Magistris, a

* Jewell, in his Reply, p. 185.

† Greg. l. 7, Epist. 30, Indict. 1.

‡ Bede, l. 2, c. 3, Hist.

§ [Interea missus est Augustinus a beato Gregorio Papa in Britanniam.... Postquam autem venit Augustinus, invenit septem episcopatus..... Abbas Dionot, Augustino petenti ab episcopis Britonibus subjectionem, ipsos ei nullam subjectionem debere respondit.—l. xi. c. 12. This is the whole of Geoffrey's account of St. Augustine; and this, forsooth, is to sustain the accusation of hypocrisy, superstition, cruelty, &c.!]

|| Mr. Jewell, in the Apol. of England, par. 4.

school divine, who, proposing the question whether simple fornication be mortal sin or no, and disputing the matter to and fro, as school doctors are wont to do, alleging arguments on both sides, doth conclude finally that it is not only sin, but mortal sin also. And this he proveth by six several conclusions, and solveth the objections made on the other side, proving it also out of St. Paul* that it excludeth from the kingdom of heaven.† But yet for that he saith in the beginning, *arguitur quod non*—it may be objected to the contrary that it is no sin—Mr. Jewell is affirmed to have taken it for the other's position, which seemeth as well gross folly as wilful fraud.

15. The fifth example is, of falsifying the words and meaning of the third council of Carthage, wherein St. Augustine was present, citing it thus: *The old council of Carthage*, saith he, *commendeth nothing to be read in Christ's congregation but the canonical Scriptures.*‡ But he leaveth out the words immediately following—*sub nomine Divinarum Scripturarum* (under the name of Divine Scriptures); as also the other explication that followeth in the same council: *Liceat etiam legi passiones martyrum, cum anniversarii eorum dies celebrantur* §—"It is lawful also to read in the church (*besides canonical Scriptures*) the passions of martyrs, when their yearly festival days are celebrated." All which Mr. Jewell leaveth out of purpose, and, consequently, say they, he cannot be defended from witting fraud.

16. The sixth example is, of falsifying Pope Leo the First, in these words: *Pope Leo holdeth that, upon one day, it is lawful to have but one mass in one church*; || and citeth him, Epist. 81, *ad Dioscorum Episcopum Alexandrinum*, cap. 2. But he that shall read the place shall find expressly that Pope Leo doth ordain unto the said Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, that sundry masses be said in one church upon one day, when multitudes of people do concur, one after the other, in solemn festivities: so as

* 1 Cor. xvi.

† The like doth the L. Plessis Mornay. See part 3, c. 9, sect. 1.

‡ Concil. 3, Carthag. can. 27.

§ See c. 9, n. 5, 6. || Jewell, in his Apol.

Pope Leo doth hold and decree the quite contrary* to that which Mr. Jewell affirmeth him to hold. And like to this is the seventh example,† wherein Mr. Jewell affirmeth flatly Pope Celestinus to have been a Nestorian heretic; whereas it is most clear, by all histories,‡ that Pope Celestinus was he that condemned Nestorius and all his heresies, in confirming the third general council of Ephesus, that accursed him. In which council Cyrillus, Archbishop of Alexandria, sat as president, and legate of the said Pope Celestinus, against Nestorius, and the Nestorian heresy.

17. The eighth example is a notable abuse of a place of Scripture, to deceive the reader.§ For whereas Mr. Jewell would make him believe that the words of Christ to St. Peter, *Thou art a rock, and upon this rock will I build my church*; || and again, *Feed my lambs, feed my sheep*, ¶ were spoken as well to all the apostles, as to St. Peter, he citeth for proof hereof another saying of our Saviour: *Quod uni dico, omnibus dico*, (that which I say to one I say to all); which sentence is not found in Scripture; but another like it, though to another purpose, to wit, about the watchfulness which our Saviour would have all men use for the day of judgment: *Quod vobis dico, omnibus dico, vigilate***—"That which I say to you (here present) I speak to all (both absent and to come), Be watchful of this day." Wherein Christ speaketh not of authority given by him, but of the general watchfulness which he would have to be in all; whereof Mr. Jewell not being ignorant, the abuse of the said place, to the beguiling of his reader, must needs be thought both absurd and shameful: and so much the more, for that he insulteth upon Dr. Harding about the matter, saying, *Mr. Harding affirmeth,*

* [...cum plenum pietatis atque rationis sit ut quoties basilicam, in qua agitur, præsentia novæ plebis impleverit, toties sacrificium subsequens offeratur. Necesse est autem ut quædam populi pars sua devotione privetur, si unus tantum Missæ, more servato, sacrificium offerre non possint, nisi qui prima diei parte convenerint. Studiose ergo delectionem tuam et familiariter admonemus, ut quod nostræ consuetudini ex forma paternæ traditionis in-
cedit, tua quoque cura non negligat, &c.—Labbe, iii. 1375, &c.]

† Jewell, p. 131.

‡ Jewell, Apol. 108.

¶ John xxi.

§ See Baron. tom. v. an. 431.

|| Matt. xvi.

** Mark xiii. 37.

that to the rest of the apostles it was not said at all, Feed ye, &c.; to Peter, and to none else, was it said, Feed my lambs, feed my sheep; yet Christ himself saith, Quod uni dico, omnibus dico, (that I say to one I say to all); and quoteth for it Mark xiii.; which place I perusing, and finding the fraud, could not but greatly marvel thereat; and the observation set down by the author of the foresaid treatise of “Equivocation,” who objected all these places against Mr. Jewell, stuck much in my mind; which was, that if Christ’s words had been, as Mr. Jewell allegeth them out of the 13th of St. Mark, *That which I say to one I say to all,—Be watchful;* and that the meaning had been as he urgeth, to wit, equality of authority in all over the church; then, seeing the last word, *vigilate* (be watchful), appertaineth to all of all sexes and sorts, so must also the words *Feed my sheep, feed my lambs*, appertain to all sorts of people; which were very absurd to affirm; for that hereby women should have as much authority in the church as men; for that their obligation to watch is no less than in men.

Scriptures
egregiously
abused by Mr.
Jewell.

CHAPTER VI.

Of other places observed by my own reading out of Master Jewell's Works, of like unsincerity to the former, which greatly moved me to suspect his infidelity in writing.

AND thus much, for saving of labour, I thought best to note out of the said treatise against Mr. Morton, notwithstanding that divers of these points, with a great number more I had observed before by my own reading of Mr. Jewell's works; of which I thought expedient to adjoin some few more in this place among many and almost infinite, which other men do object against him as committed by him in his only two books of "Reply" and "Defence," and they are all of that sort and kind, which often we have mentioned, that is to say, such as seem cannot be excused or denied to have proceeded from witting error, and wilful fraud of the writer. As, for example, whereas Mr. Jewell, in the 107th page of his "Defence of the Apology of the Church of England," treating against the supremacy of St. Peter, allegeth St. Jerome, in his book against Jovinian, the heretic (that equalled marriage with virginity) saying: *Dices, super Petrum fundatur ecclesia,* &c.*—"You will say the church is founded upon Peter," notwithstanding, in another place, the same thing is done upon all the apostles, "and all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the church is founded equally upon them all."

2. Thus St. Jerome, in the former part of his answer to Jovinian, which Mr. Jewell, abstracting from the rest that ensueth immediately (for so it is evident by the imperfect sense of the sentence), leaveth out, and cutteth off the words that most import for

St. Jerome
misalleged
about the su-
premacie.

* Jérôme, l. 1 contra Jovin.

decision of the question, which are these * (*tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio*)—"yet among the twelve there is one chosen out, to the end, that he being ordained head, the occasion of schism might be taken away."—"Here then we see," say the Papists, "evident fraud to be used, and that of purpose, for that the very principal conclusion, and resolution of St. Jerome to Jovinian's objection is guilefully cut off." Jovinian's objection was, that if virginity were of so great merit above marriage, why was not St. John the Evangelist made head of the church, that was a virgin, and why was Peter chosen that had been a married man? So, as in those days, it was not unknown nor unconfessed, say they, that St. Peter was head of the church, which had been more to St. Jerome's purpose to have denied, if he might have done it; but he only saith that St. Peter was not so head, nor so the foundation, but that the church was also builded upon all the apostles, as St. Paul to the Ephesians doth testify; yet, saith St. Jerome, *for avoiding of schism, Peter was chosen among the twelve, and constituted head*;† "which words," saith Mr. Harding,‡ "for that they made against Mr. Jewell, he left them quite out, citing only a piece of the sentence with an imperfect sense," which myself, also conferring, found to be true.

3. It followeth in the same page of Mr. Jewell's "Defence."§ St. Chrysostom, saith he, writeth thus of

* [It will be best to exhibit the scope and context of the passage. St. Jerome is engaged in shewing the honour attached to virginity. In answer to Jovinian, who referred to the apostles as being married men, he instances favours and distinctions accorded to St. John, the youngest of the sacred college, on this very account:—*quem fides Christi virginem repererat, virgo permansit*. And he challenges Jovinian to assign any other reason for his having been loved more than the rest. But Jovinian might say: Yet the church was founded on Peter, a married man: why was not John chosen? (*i. e.* chosen to be head or chief of the church). St. Jerome's words are as follows:—*At dicis, super Petrum fundatur ecclesia, licet id ipsum in alio loco (Eph. ii.) super omnes apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves cœlorum accipiant, et ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur: tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio. Sed cur non Joannes electus est virgo? Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat, &c.*]

† Ephes. ii.

‡ Harding, Detect. f. 156.

§ Defence, p. 107.

Peter: *Duplex crimen erat, tum quia repugnavit, tum quia ceteris seipsum præposuit*,"* which Mr. Jewell translateth thus: "Peter was in double fault, both for that he withstood Christ, and also for that he set himself before the rest."† Whereof Mr. Jewell would infer, that it was a fault in St. Peter to set himself before the rest; that is to say, to presume to be the chief, and head of the apostles; which seemeth a plain corruption of the meaning both of St. Chrysostom and of the Gospel itself. For in the first part, that St. Peter repugned to the will of Christ, is meant, that he, signifying his repugnance that our Saviour should suffer, it was said unto him: *Go after me, Satan, thou art a scandal to me.*‡ And, in the other part, is meant the fervent and forward answer of St. Peter, when he said to our Saviour, *That albeit all the rest shall be scandalized, or offended in thee, I will not be offended*:§ both which speeches St. Chrysostom doth reprehend; the first of repugning to Christ's will, the other of some rashness in presuming of himself to be more firm and constant than the rest, which is far from Mr. Jewell's meaning, that he set himself before the rest in authority, or that St. Chrysostom had ever any such meaning, that that was a crime in St. Peter. For that in the very same homily out of which the former words were taken (as by conference I found) St. Chrysostom, speaking both of Christ and St. Peter, hath these words: *Etiam ipsum apostolorum verticem*|| *negare permisit*—"Christ permitted even the top or head of the apostles to deny him." And, in another homily, ¶ he calleth him, *Principem Apostolorum*—"Prince of the Apostles:" and, in a third, *to whom the charge, and government of the whole world is committed*:** in this, then, it seemed that Mr. Jewell had not dealt faithfully, but that, wittingly and wilfully, he had perverted both the sense of St. Chrysostom, and of Christ himself.

4. In the same "Defence of the Apology," p. 108, Mr.

* [Καὶ γὰρ δύο τὰ ἐγκλήματα ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἀντέπε, καὶ ὅτι τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν προῦθηκε. (St. Chrysostom is speaking in reference to the apostle's words, Matt. xxvi. 33.)]

† Homil. 81, in Matt.

‡ Matt. xvi.

§ Matt. xxvi.

|| Τὸν κορυφαῖον.

¶ Homil. 21, in 1 Cor. ix.

** Homil. 55, in Matt.

Jewell, alleging a place of St. Jerome for the equality of bishops' government and authority, citeth these words: *Ubicumque fuerit, episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, &c. ejusdem est meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii,** which he englisheth thus: "Wheresoever there be a bishop, be it at Rome, be it at Eugubium, &c., they are all of one worthi-

St. Jerome
abused about
the supremacy.

ness, they are all of one bishopric;" whereby he would prove that one bishop is not above another in authority; whereas St. Jerome's meaning is, that a bishop, whether he be of a great city or a little, is equal to the rest in his dignity of priesthood and merit by the same; so as he should have translated it, "wheresoever a bishop is bishop, whether at Rome, or at Eugubium, &c., he is of the selfsame merit, and of the selfsame priesthood:" the word *merit* Mr. Jewell, flying, translated it worthiness, the word *priesthood* he translateth bishopric; but that St. Jerome did not think all bishops equal in authority (which Mr. Jewell would hence infer) seemeth plain by his words and writings in divers places of his works, as in his 57th epistle to Pope Damasius,† where, concerning the name of Hypostasis, having said, *Therefore, I thought it behoved me to take counsel and direction at the chair of St. Peter, and the faith commended by the mouth of the apostle*, a little after he saith thus: *Quanquam tui me terreat magnitudo, invitat tamen humanitas‡*—"Albeit your greatness doth make me to fear, yet your courtesy and mildness doth invite me." And again: *Ego nullum primum, &c.*—"I, following none chief but Christ, am united in communion with your happiness, that is to say, with Peter's chair; upon that rock I know the church to be built." And, a little after, *Non novi Vitalem, &c.*—"I know not Vitalis, I reject Meletius, I acknowledge not Paulinus" (which was his own bishop, St. Jerome being a priest of Alexandria). *Quicumque tecum non colligit, spargit, &c.*—"Whosoever gathereth not with you, he scattereth;" that is to say, he that is not of Christ, is of Antichrist. And, in his 58th epistle§ about the same matter, having shewed how he was pressed by au-

* Jerome, in epist. ad Evagrium.

† Jerome, ep. 57 ad Damasum.

‡ Ibid.

§ Epist. 58, ad Damasum.

thority of example of others to incline to the Arian heresy : *Ego interim clamito* (saith he) *si quis cathedræ Petri jun- gitur, meus est**—" I, in the meanwhile, cry out and say, if any one be joined and agree with St. Peter's chair, he is mine, with him I agree." And, in another epistle to the said Damasus, he saith : *Cùm tu qui summus sacerdos es, fieri jubes*—" Forsomuch as thou that art the highest priest dost command me." The like he hath in divers places of his works, and therefore herein seemed to be no plain dealing of Mr. Jewell, but voluntary mistaking, and mis- construing St. Jerome.

5. Furthermore, in the " Defence of the Apology,"† page 132, Mr. Jewell, going about to weaken the authority of traditions of ancestors, allegeth St. Cyprian in a certain case, or observation of the church, in these words : *Si quis de antecessoribus meis, &c.*—" If any of my predecessors have not observed, and kept the same that our Lord hath taught us, both by his example and also by his commandment, his simplicity may be pardoned; but we, if we do the like, can hope for no pardon, being now admonished and instructed of our Lord." And here Mr. Jewell breaketh off, as though the whole sentence were ended, which indeed is the very midst of St. Cyprian's speech : for it followeth concerning the particular case whereof he speaketh : *But we can hope for no pardon, who are now admonished and instructed of our Lord, that we should offer our Lord's chalice mixed with wine, accordingly as our Lord offered the same.* So that here St. Cyprian doth rather confirm and prove the force of tradition than infringe the same : for that he defendeth the mixture of wine and water in the chalice, as a thing delivered and observed from Christ's time downward, by the imitation of Christ's own fact; which ordination, notwithstanding, is not expressly found in Scripture. Wherefore it seemeth great fraud purposely committed, that this part of the sentence, so clearly declaring St. Cyprian's mind, should so be cut off and concealed by Mr. Jewell, as truly I could not tell how to go about to defend

St. Cyprian
abused about
traditions.

* Epist. 123, ad Dam. et in ep. ad Agen. de Monog. et l. 2 contra Ruffin.

† Jewell, in his Defence, p. 132. Cyp. l. 2. epist. 3.

him therein, as neither in that he dissembled the particular case of offering wine and water mixed in the sacrifice, which, being a general received tradition, St. Cyprian saith, that if any of his ancestors should have done the contrary, upon simplicity, he might be pardoned, but such as knew the tradition, could not so easily be pardoned, it seemeth (I say) a great fraud to me, that Mr. Jewell would apply this example against tradition, and following of our ancestors in general, which St. Cyprian speaketh only in a particular case, to wit, that he was not bound to follow any one of his ancestors that should upon simplicity have dissented from the general observation of the church. So as every way it appeareth that this authority of St. Cyprian was wrongly alleged.

6. Furthermore, in the same book, page 164,* Mr. Jewell being very earnest for the marriage of priests and votaries, citeth Origen in these words: *Origen saith that St. Paul and his wife were called to the faith both at one time:* but when I went to Origen to examine the matter, I found only these words: *Paulus (sicut quidam tradunt) cum uxore vocatus est*†—"Paul (as some say) was called with a wife, that is to say, being married or having a wife before:" and then he addeth *aliis videtur sine uxore*—to others it seemeth that he was called to the apostleship without a wife, or before he was married, which last words, as also the parenthesis of Origen, to wit (*as some say*), which make the matter doubtful, Mr. Jewell cutteth quite off, but with what liberty or licence I know not; forso-much as he allegeth it to prove an article of religion, wherein all sincerity ought to be used. Likewise, in the same place, Dr. Harding accuseth him to have abused the testimony of St. Ambrose and Ignatius concerning Paul's having of a wife. And as for St. Ambrose, he is plain to the contrary,‡ for upon these words of St. Paul: *Volo autem omnes homines esse sicut meipsum*—"I would all men to be as myself am"—he saith, *hoc nunquam dixisset nisi esset integer corpore*. This St. Paul would never have said

* Jewell, in his Defence, p. 164.

† Origen, Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. c. i.

‡ Ambr. in 1 Cor. vii.

(saith St. Ambrose)* unless he had been a virgin, that is to say, never married. Dr. Harding further saith, that Mr. Jewell contradicteth himself about this matter, for that p. 184 of his "Defence," he holdeth that St. Paul had a wife, and yet, a little after, page 412, he affirmeth expressly, that St. Paul had no wife, but this may come of error or forgetfulness, which the other about Origen well could not.

7. This other example also that ensueth cannot be ascribed to forgetfulness, for that citing a constitution of the Emperor Justinian against the supremacy of the Pope of Rome, he saith: *The emperor's words stand thus: Sancimus, &c. senioris Romæ Papam primum esse omnium sacerdotum: beatissimum autem Archiepiscopum Constantino-polios novæ Romæ secundum habere locum;*† which words Mr. Jewell englisheth thus: "We ordain that the Pope of the elder Rome shall be the first of all priests, and that the most holy Archbishop of Constantinople, which is named New Rome, have the second place;"‡ of which Mr. Jewell inferreth, that the Pope's authority and pre-eminence in those days consisted only in sitting in the first place, and that this dignity also was given him by the secular power of the emperor. But here I found (to confess the truth) sundry shifts and falsehoods no way excusable. For first, whereas he saith, in Latin, *sancimus, &c.* signifying thereby somewhat to be intermitted, he, in his English translation (which most readers best understand and chiefly attend unto) leaving out the word *&c.*, saith *We ordain that the Pope of the elder Rome*; and so forth. Secondly, if a man demand what was left out by that *&c.* he shall find that they were only four words, not very cumbersome to have been set down, if true dealing had been intended, and yet on the other side are of great moment; the words then as they stand

* [It may be proper to remind the reader that the commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, heretofore generally ascribed to St. Ambrose, are the productions of Hilary the deacon, and other contemporary or more recent authors.—See the Benedictine Editors of St. Ambrose, and Ceillier, *Bibliothèque des Auteurs Eccles.* vii. 568.]

† Reply, p. 239.

‡ Just. de Sacrosan. Eccles. c. 1, t. 1.

in the "Constitution" of Justinian, are these: *Sancimus, secundum canonum definitiones, sanctissimum senioris Romæ Papam primum esse omnium sacerdotum, &c.*—"We do ordain, according to the determination of the canons, that the most holy Pope of elder Rome is the first or chief of all priests, and that the most happy Archbishop of Constantinople, which is named New Rome, hath the second place"—so, as here, the first fraud was to leave out these three words, *secundum canonum definitiones*—"according to the definition of holy canons," signifying thereby that this ordination or declaration proceeded not so much from himself as from the authority of the holy canons, that is to say, he did confirm and command the execution of ecclesiastical canons in that behalf by his imperial authority.

The supremacy according to the ancient canons.

8. The third fraud is, that he left out the word *sanctissimum*, the most holy Pope of elder Rome, which is used by the emperor, and yet gives the same title in English to the Patriarch of Constantinople, that was inferior to him; whereas the true words of the "Constitution" are, *Sanctissimum senioris Romæ Papam*—the most holy Pope of elder Rome, *et beatissimum Archiepiscopum Constantinopolios*—the most holy Bishop of Constantinople, called New Rome. The fourth fraud is, that he translateth *primum esse omnium sacerdotum* thus, that he shall be the first of all priests, whereas the emperor, in Latin, uses the present tense, and not the future, wherein there is great difference in this case, for that by like reasons Constantine, the first Christian emperor, might have written: *We ordain and declare, according to the definitions of the canons of the Council of Nice, that Christ is God, equal to his Father*, and yet he could not say, that he shall be God, for that importeth so much as that he was not God before; and the like is seen in this speech of Justinian, where the Pope is declared to be *primum omnium sacerdotum*—"the chief of all priests;" not that he shall be, or should be from that time forward, as Mr. Jewell, by translating *shall be* for *is*, doth endeavour to persuade his reader. Here then upon examination everywhere I found fraud, and remained much confused.

9. But a greater fraud I found yet used in the very next words of this "Constitution" that immediately do ensue, which are these: "We ordain also that the most holy Archbishop of Justiniana the First, which is our country, shall have for ever under his jurisdiction the bishops of the provinces of Dacia, Dania, Dardania, Mysia, and Pannonia, and that they shall be invested by him, and he only by his own counsel; and that he in the provinces subject unto him shall have the place of the apostolic see of Rome, &c." Out of which words Mr. Jewell inferreth thus: "Here we see," saith he, "the Bishop of Justiniana set in as high authority and power, within his own jurisdiction, as the Bishop of Rome within his." But here I saw indeed more than I would, which was that the fraud was too manifest; for that the ensuing words that expound and declare are guilefully cut off, which are: *secundum eaque sanctus Papa Vigilius constituit*—"We ordain that these things shall be done and observed, according to that which the holy Pope Vigilius hath constituted:" so that, as in the former decree the emperor professeth himself to have ordained according to the definition of the canons, so here in particular he professed to have confirmed the constitutions of holy Pope Vigilius, who had made the Archbishop of Justiniana to be his legate, and to hold the place of the apostolic see of Rome in those provinces: not unlike to that of St. Gregory, who, according to Venerable Bede, in his history,* gave the like authority to St. Augustine, our first Archbishop of Canterbury, by which concession they have always been called *Legati nati Sedis Apostolicæ*. And thus much for this shift or falsification, which greatly grieved me to find it so inexcusable as I did, by conferring the places themselves.

10. The same Mr. Jewell, in the foresaid book of "Defence of the Apology,"† writing many things to weaken the credit of succession of bishops in the church, and certainty of true faith and doctrine to be received thereby, writeth thus among other things: "By succession Christ saith, *that desolation shall sit in the holy place, and Antichrist shall press into the room of Christ:*" and for proof

* Bed. lib. 1, cap. 27.

† See Defence, p. 132.

noteth in the margin Matt. xxiv., which, when I had perused, I found plainly, that besides that our Saviour saith no one such word, that desolation (or Antichrist) shall enter *by succession*, the nature of the thing itself, methought, repugned evidently to the speech of Mr. Jewell, for that Antichrist entering by violence shall rather dissolve all lawful succession of priests and bishops continued from the apostles to his time, than enter himself by succession, which point seemeth to have been foretold expressly by St. Paul to the Thessalonians,* when he saith, *that except defection* (or apostasy) *go before* (which is an open breach from orderly succession and subordination), *the man of sin shall not be revealed.*† Wherefore Mr. Jewell is here accused for falsifying the words and meaning of our Saviour, as also those of St. Paul, speaking of heretics, which Mr. Jewell allegeth against succession thus: “Of succession St. Paul saith to the faithful at Ephesus: ‘I know that after my departure hence ravening wolves shall enter and succeed me, and out of yourselves there shall (*by succession*) spring up men speaking perversely.’” All which seemeth fraudulently alleged, for that St. Paul hath never a word of *succession* or *succeeding*, but rather manifestly signifieth the contrary by the words *intrabunt in vos*, they shall enter upon you (without calling) *non parcentes gregi*, which Mr. Jewell omitted, “not sparing the flock,” which is a note of violent entrance, *et ex vobis ipsis exurgent*—“there shall rise up some from among yourselves”—all which words do import rather a violent entering, and a wilful usurping and rising up of themselves, than an orderly succession or calling by lawful means. Wherefore to see Mr. Jewell put in the word *succession* of his own, and that such heretics should succeed St. Paul, which he neither said nor meant, misliked me exceedingly, and the rather, for that he strived by such enforced texts and authorities to prove the Pope to be Antichrist, which the most of the learned divines in England do altogether deny, as we have touched before.

11. Moreover, whereas Mr. Jewell, in his “Apology,”‡ doth amplify many things against Popes and their pride,

* Thess. ii.

† Defence, p. 127.

‡ Sup. p. 1, cap. 7.

as that he commanded the emperor to go by him at his horse bridle, and the French king to hold his stirrup and the like, which his adversary, Mr. Harding, affirmeth to be only an odious amplification, and that never Pope can be proved to have commanded any such thing: Mr. Jewell goeth forward saying: *Who hurled under his table Francis Dandalus, the Duke of Venice, King of Creta and Cyprus, fast bound with chains, to feed of bones among his dogs!* Whereto the said Mr. Harding answering, assevereth five notable lies, to use his words, to be contained in this little sentence, for that neither Francis Dandalus was Duke of Venice, when he was sent to the Pope in this embassy, for the dukes of that state cannot go forth of the city, as all men know; neither was he King of Creta, nor Cyprus, that name (of king) not being tolerable in the free state of Venice; and as for the duke at that time, his name was Joannes Superantius, and Dandalus was but a private man sent ambassador to Clement the Fifth, then Pope, to obtain the renunciation of an interdict, which was laid upon the said city; and, finding the Pope somewhat hard to yield to his supplication, he devised of himself this stratagem, to cause an iron chain to be put about his own neck, and to creep in upon his hands and knees while the Pope was at dinner, and there lay down under the table, and would not rise until he had obtained pardon and remission for his country; and this Dr. Harding proveth out of divers principal authors and writers of the Venetian commonwealth, as of Petrus Justinianus, Petrus Bembus, Sabellicus, and others.* So as neither was this the Pope's fact or commandment, nor was Dandalus Duke of Venice, but a private man, when he did this, much less was he a king; neither was he hurled down by the Pope, and much less fast bound with chains, for he took them voluntarily; nor was he appointed to feed on bones among the Pope's dogs (if he had any), but of his own will laid himself there for the end before specified. So as all these voluntary additions of Mr. Jewell do discredit much his fidelity in relating matters, for that

*five lies
urged in one
sentence.*

* Just. l. 4, Histor. Venet.; Bemb. Hist. Venet. Sabel. Decad. 2, l. 1. 120, et Ennead. 9, lib. 8, 260.

hereby is seen that truth is not sought, but exaggerations and amplifications to make things odious, which in writers of matters concerning religion is neither commendable nor beseeching.* But now hearken what ensued hereof.

A great absurdity of Mr. Jewell in denying the Decades of Sabellicus.

12. Not long after this again, Mr. Jewell, preaching at Paul's Cross, and seeking to excuse or divert the odiousness of this falsification, objected unto him by Mr. Harding, layeth hold upon the allegations used by Dr. Harding, out of Sabellicus's Decades, declaring to the people, with many rhetorical scoffs, jests, and amplifications, that Sabellicus never wrote any Decades, but only Enneades, affirming that not only learned men, but *ipsis etiam puerulis* (to use his words), even to little children themselves that go to grammar schools, and have any least learning in the Latin tongue, it is ridiculous to say that Sabellicus did ever write Decades; and this doth testify a learned Protestant minister and preacher, that was present at that time at the sermon, whose words are these, in a learned book, written by him, in Latin: *Ego quidem adfui concioni, &c.*—"I was present myself at that sermon, and heard him jest, and delight his hearers (wherein he was excellent) with this oversight of his adversary, but after the sermon was ended,† I, knowing the man to be affable enough, although I had no great familiarity with him, went to him and took him by the hand, and leading him a little aside from the people, I did, in honourable terms, advertise him of his error, and shewed forth the Decades of Sabellicus, that were to be sold in the very next bookseller's shop." Thus writeth that learned man of his own

* ["What shall we say of him that *made* the noble King Dandalus to be tied by the neck with a chain, and to lie flat down before his table, *there to gnaw bones like a dog*? Shall we think that he had God's holy spirit within him, or not rather the spirit of the devil? Such a tyrant was Pope Clement VI."—Church of England's Homily for Whitsunday. (Oxford ed. 1840, p. 416.) The authority given in the margin is Sabel. Ennead. 9, lib. 7. A whole page of similar fictions or distortions follows the passage just extracted;—as that of "Pope Joan the harlot," &c.—Surely some other instruction might have been provided by the Church of England for Christian hearers on a festival commemorative of the descent of the HOLY SPIRIT OF TRUTH!]

† Guil. Reginald. Calvino-turc. l. 1, c. 5.

hearing and experience, which verily gave me great cause to wonder, that such a man would be taken so easily in such gross errors, especially they being in points not much concerning the cause itself, for that this allegation of Sabellianus did not seem to me to be of any great moment; and rather, methought, I would have seen Mr. Jewell to have verified the particulars, which are touched in the history of Francis Dandalus, and denied by his adversary as apparent untruths.

13. Another notorious untruth seemeth to be set down by my Mr. Jewell, in the "Defence of the Apology," against the ancient Council of Carthage, the second, that decreed that bishops, priests, and deacons should abstain and live continent; which decree Mr. Jewell, forgetting with what confidence he had appealed before in his challenge to the ancient councils, or to any one sentence thereof, and particularly by name to prove thereby fraudulently that only Scriptures were to be read in the church—forgetting, I say, all this, he doth now inveigh against this ancient second Council of Carthage, affirming the same to be quite contrary to the commandment of God and the Council of Nice.* His words be these: "It decreeth," saith he, "of set purpose, quite contrary to the Council of Nice, for the fathers in the Nicene Council durst not forbid priests the use of marriages, but these without any sticking, or doubting at the matter, only with one word, utterly removed them, and so by force and violence, and contrary to the commandment of Christ, sundered and divided them whom God had joined; which thing holy Paphnutius saith was not lawful for a man to do. In which charge against so holy a council, sundry untruths are noted in Mr. Jewell; as, namely, that of Paphnutius and the Council of Nice, which hath been sufficiently refuted before, against Mr. Bell.† And then, for that he saith that they decreed the same by force and violence, and contrary to the commandment of Christ, and against antiquity; whereas the reason of this decree is set

About the second Council of Carthage discredited by Mr. Jewell.

* Defence of the Apology, f. 234, Con. Carth. 2, can. 9, ann. 396.

† Supra, c. 9, part 1.

down by them, and by St. Augustine himself, that was present, in the second canon, and in all their names, in these words: *Ut quod apostoli docuerunt, et ipsa servavit antiquitas, nos quoque custodiamus; et ab universis episcopis dictum est, Omnibus, placet, &c.*—"To the end that we may observe that which the apostles did teach, and antiquity itself hath observed; whereunto all the bishops answered, We do all agree that bishops, and priests, and deacons, which minister the sacrament, shall observe chastity, and abstain themselves even from wives; and by all it was said, *We agree that chastity be observed in all who serve at the altar.*" Hitherto are the words of the canon, which seem to condemn Mr. Jewell of much untrue speeches in his invective against so many holy and ancient fathers, who are found not to have decreed any thing against Scripture or the Council of Nice; but conform to that which the apostles themselves did teach, and Christian antiquity after them.

14. But of all other things that I have read or seen alleged against Mr. Jewell for unconscionable dealing, this seemeth to me most singular, that, in the fourth part of the Latin "Apology of the Church of England," whereof he confesseth himself to be the author, he layeth such a false charge of impiety against Cardinal Hosius, and by such false means, as wonderfully offended me to read the matter as it passed, and is to be seen in the said "Apology," both in Latin and English, and in Dr. Harding's confutation of the same. For whereas Mr. Jewell, writing the said "Apology" in Latin, found belike, among other notes gathered for his purpose, that Cardinal Hosius, in his book *de expresso Verbo Dei*, as also in another, *de Hæresibus*, against Brentius, complained of the multitude of sects and heresies sprung up in our days, all pretending Scripture for their ground (though misinterpreted), so far forth, as that Luther himself, seeing the event thereof, had written that the Bible was now become *liber hæreticorum*,* "the book of heretics:" and then further, the same cardinal, shewing that there was a new later brood sprung up, of Zuinkefeldian heretics (their author being one Gasper

* Luth. lib. quod verba Christi (Hoc est corpus meum) consistant, &c.

Zuinkefeldius, a German), who, by pretence of Scripture, did take away all authority of written Scriptures, persuading men only to attend to inspirations and inward revelations; alleging for that doctrine the words of the psalm, *I will hear what the Lord speaketh in me*;* and many other such texts of Scripture misconstrued. Mr. Jewell, I say, falling upon this note gathered out of Hosius, would needs publish the same, as Hosius's own words, sense, and meaning, with great outcries and invectives against both him, the Pope, and all Catholics, as though they had been of that mind and opinion that all written Scriptures were to be rejected.

Extraordinary
false dealing
of Mr. Jewell
against Ho-
sius.

15. And albeit, when the said Latin "Apology" came to the print, this error being discovered, was told unto him, yet he would needs have it pass; and when, after the said "Apology" being translated into English by a certain lady, and to be printed also, the said oversight or malice being more detected by conference of Hosius's books, was again more earnestly represented unto him; to wit, that these words, cited by him for contempt of the outward letter of Scripture, were not the words of Hosius, but of Zuinkefeldius; and for such are detected and confuted by Hosius; yet he would needs have them printed again, and sought, by certain additions in the English text, more than was in the Latin,† to justify the same, or, at leastwise, to make it seem probable that, albeit they were not Hosius's words, but rehearsed by him as of those Zuinkefeldian heretics, yet that in his heart he liked of them.‡ Nay, he goeth further, saying that Hosius not only holdeth the same in his own private opinion, but as the common opinion of all those of his band.§ "Hearken

A. B., id est,
Anne Bacon.

* Psalm lxxxiv.

[† Namely, the salvo: "He dissembleth, I grant you, indeed, and hideth," &c. (see next page). This salvo does not appear in the Latin text. (Ran- dolphi Enchiridion, i. 157, Oxford, 1812.) Instead of it, there is this marginal note: "Hæc Hosius in lib. de expresso verbo Dei, sed astute, et sub *allevius persona*; quanquam et *ipse* alias eadem, in eodem etiam libro, disertis *verbis affirmet*." Which note, 1st, contradicts the text; and, 2ndly, repeats the calumny.]

‡ Jewell, Apol. cap. 19, divis. 1, and in Defence, fol. 517.

§ ["Whereas it is neither Hosius nor any Catholic that speaketh them, but

(saith Mr. Jewell) how holily and how godlily one Hosius writeth of this matter, a bishop in Polonia, as he testifieth of himself; a man, doubtless, well spoken, and not unlearned, and a very sharp and stout maintainer of that side. Thou wilt marvel, I suppose, how any good man could either conceive so wickedly or write so despitefully of those words, which he knew proceeded from God's mouth, and specially in such sort, as he would not have it seem his own private opinion alone, but the common opinion of all that band."

Do not the ministers, with like falsehood, continually persuade ignorant people that the Catholics do condemn and set light by the Holy Scriptures?

This is Mr. Jewell's *preludium* or preface to his reader; and then he addeth presently these words: "He dissembleth, I grant you, indeed, and hideth what he is, and setteth forth the matter so, as though it were not he and his side, but the Zuinkefeldian heretics, that so did speak. *We* (saith he) *will bid away with the Scriptures, whereof we see brought, not only divers, but also contrary, interpretations; we will hear God speak, rather than resort to the naked elements, or bare words of the Scriptures, &c.*"*

16. And having written this, and other such speeches, as proceeding from Hosius, he concludeth thus: *THIS IS HOSIUS'S SAYING, uttered altogether with the same spirit and the same mind wherewith, in times past, Montanus and Marcion were moved, &c.* And then crieth out against all Papists in these words: *What then shall I say here, O ye principal posts of religion! and ye archgovernors of Christ's church! Is this your reverence which you give to God's word, to bid them avaunt away? &c. No marvel if these men despise us and all our doings, which set so little by God himself, and his infallible sayings.* Thus writeth and inveigheth Mr. Jewell against all of the Roman religion, even after the time he had been twice admonished that his whole ground was false and forged; which truly so asto-

only Zuinkefeldius himself. As well might he (Jewell) have appeached the ancient fathers of heresies, because in sundry places of their works they allege the words of the heretics whom they confute. So should St. Basil be made an Eunomian, St. Ambrose an Arian, St. Augustine a Pelagian," &c.—Harding's Confutation, 215.]

* Hosius De Expresso Verbo Dei. [This is Jewell's reference, l. 2. The reader should bear that in mind, for a reason which will appear by-and-by.]

nished me, when I went to read and confer the places themselves, both in the said "Apology" and in Hosius himself, in the two books before mentioned, as I could not tell what to say or what to think of Mr. Jewell's conscience, prudence, or civility in this matter; for it seemed to me to pass all madness, so obstinately and desperately to set down and urge, in such manner, a thing so confutable by so many and irrefragable witnesses, and especially by Hosius's own express words, often repeated in the same book *de Expresso Verbo Dei: Natum est novum quoddam prophetarum genus, &c.*—"There is sprung up (saith Hosius) a certain new kind of prophets, who have not been afraid, by the authority of Scriptures, to take away all authority from the Scripture: Behold whither Satan at length hath brought this matter, &c." Again, to shew, notwithstanding heretics' abusing of Scripture, how reverently himself esteemed thereof, he hath these words, among many other: *Nihil Scriptura sanctius, nihil augustius, nihil secundum Deum veneratione dignius, &c.*—"Nothing is more holy than the Scripture, nothing more noble or excellent; there is nothing, next to God himself, more worthy of all veneration and reverence: but what thing can there be so holy, which the enemy of mankind may not abuse to man's destruction, &c.?" Thus Hosius.

My admiration at this false dealing.

Hosius's venerable estimation of the Holy Scripture.

17. And this were now sufficient to shew Mr. Jewell's intolerable false dealing, and wilful belying of his adversaries. But I will also admonish the reader of that which yet further, by examination of things, I observed, to my greater astonishment, concerning this matter; which is, that Mr. Jewell himself knew well enough, both before and after his sundry admonitions of this error, that he wrote that which was evidently false, even in his own conscience; for he had undoubtedly read that other book of Hosius, *de Hæresibus*, as may be presumed, it being set forth A. D. 1557, five years before the other, *de Expresso Verbo Dei*, which was printed A. D. 1562; but especially the same book, *de Hæresibus*, being translated into Eng-

An observation of great wilfulness in Mr. Jewell, when he knew he wrote falsely.

lish, and dedicated to the queen's majesty, by Mr. Shacklock, and named by him "The Hatchet of Heresies," printed A.D. 1565, which was two years also before Mr. Jewell set forth his "Defence of the Apology," which was A.D. 1567.

The "Hatchet of Heresies."

18. And in this foresaid book, named, "The Hatchet of Heresies," are those words of Zuinkefeldius which Mr. Jewell recited for Hosius's own words, orderly set down; all which are not to be found in the other forenamed book *de Expresso Verbo Dei*; and therefore if Mr. Jewell, as is very probable, took those words out of this book, namely, "The Hatchet of Heresies," he could not but see, and know, how that Bishop Hosius doth most eagerly inveigh against the Zuinkefeldian heretics for this their contempt of Holy Scripture; and this in many places, from page 49 of that book, where, declaring the accusation of this Zuinkefeldian heresy to have proceeded from a saying of Luther, that the canonical Scripture hath at length got this name, to be called the book of heretics, because all heretics do fly to the Scripture for succour, therefore (saith Hosius) Zuinkefeldius, perceiving this, and peradventure having read it in Luther's books, he himself devised a new heresy; and, leaning to the aid and help of Scripture, he went about to take away all authority from the Scripture; for this talk he was wont to have among his disciples: "It behoveth not a man to be cunning in the law or in the Scripture, but to be taught and instructed of God, &c."* And then followeth the rest, rehearsed by Mr. Jewell, which is not to be found at all in that other book, *de Expresso Verbo Dei*, which he citeth.† But Hosius, going forward and inveighing against this heresy, hath these words at length, amongst others:—

Cardinal Hosius's words to the King of Polonia.

19. "Behold, most godly prince (speaking to the King of Polonia, to whom he dedicated his book, as also the former, *de Expresso Verbo Dei*), behold," saith he, "to what issue they have brought the matter, after that, by the example of Luther, every man took it to be lawful for him to go from assent and consent of

* Hatchet of Heresies, fol. 51, 52.

† [Vide supra, p. 198, note.]

the whole church, and expound the Scriptures after his own brain, &c. Men were taught to give more credit to dreams and revelations than to the Scriptures," &c. And a little after: "So now," saith he, "the gospel which Satan hath begun by Luther, he hath finished by Zuinkefeldius, that, after priesthood is taken away, after the sacrifice is despatched, after that all holy things be brought into utter contempt, we may see also the outward ministry of the word to be taken from us, the canonical Scriptures to be so stripped of all their dignity, as that we be charged not to believe them; that the Scripture is not the word of God, but only a dead letter," &c.

20. This, and much more to this purpose, is uttered by Hosius in the "Hatchet of Heresies," which I myself have seen. But for that every man, perhaps, cannot come easily to the sight thereof, I thought good to recite somewhat also out of the said book, which I presumed greatly (upon the grounds before mentioned) Mr. Jewell to have seen and read before he wrote the "Apology," wherein, first, he charged Hosius with the foresaid words, in derogation of Holy Scripture, or at least before he wrote his "Defence" thereof, to the end the discreet reader may judge, whether I had just cause to be scandalized and offended at such manner of writing and defending matters of religion, or not. For hereby, I must confess, I lost the greatest part of my former opinion of truth and sincerity in this man's speeches, doings, and writings; especially after I had heard and pondered somewhat upon a certain consideration laid before me by a certain learned man of the Catholic side, which, in effect, was this that ensueth: That if, in the beginning of the Christian religion, there should have been some two or three of the chief fathers and doctors of those ages (as Mr. Jewell was of the English Protestant Church, at the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign) that should have been taken and convinced of so many frauds and falsehoods in their writings, or half so many as this man is, for any thing that I can see to the contrary, what infinite hurt would it have brought to the credit of the Christian reli-

How I lost my opinion of Mr. Jewell's sincerity.

A weighty consideration of a learned Catholic.

gion; or who would have stayed himself with a settled conscience in matters taught by them?

THE CONCLUSION OF THIS CHAPTER, WITH CERTAIN NOTES
UPON MR. JEWELL'S MANNER OF WRITING.

Section 3.

Now then, to pass no further in this search of Mr. Jewell's oversights, and escapes in this behalf, if so they may be termed, I must advise the reader that all this which I have noted is not, perhaps, the fortieth or fiftieth part of all those untruths which those of the Roman religion, in their books, do charge him with, as voluntary, and witting untruths and falsehoods. For first, as before we have noted, whereas Mr. Jewell had proposed, in his challenge at Paul's Cross, some twenty-seven or twenty-eight several articles, and Dr. Harding having answered briefly the same, Mr. Jewell came upon him with this great, and large reply, set forth in folio, in approbation of all those articles, the said Dr. Harding made his first rejoinder about the first article only; and yet saith in the preface of the said rejoinder (as before you have heard), that the number of untruths uttered of Mr. Jewell's part, noted and confuted by three only that wrote against him—to wit, Dr. Sanders, Dr. Stapleton, and himself—amounted to above a thousand and odd; and this only in answering to five articles of Mr. Jewell's challenge, besides the combat that was afterward about the "Apology" and "Defence." And truly, though unto me, in the examination of many of his untruths (for all I could not), I do confess that all are not of like weight, nor of like voluntary falsehood as these which, for example sake, I have quoted; yet must I needs say, that I found not many objected by the Catholics, which wholly I could excuse, or that I found Mr. Jewell, in his answer, fully to have cleared.

22. For the reader must note, that Mr. Jewell, in his "Defence" of the "Apology," which was the last great book that he wrote, upon the year 1567, as hath been said, considering the huge multitude of untruths, objected

against him, and clamours made about the same, resolved to make a certain particular defence of himself concerning the said objected untruths, calling it "A View of Untruths objected, &c.," as well made against his challenge, and reply for the same, as also against the "Apology" and "Defence" thereof; but yet, as the said Dr. Harding writeth, he did choose out but one-and-thirty to defend, of all that were objected, and fifteen by name (of those one-and-thirty), out of the foresaid thousand and odd; yea, and of these fifteen (saith Dr. Harding), the first nine he is driven to acknowledge, saying nothing in their defence. And as for the other sixteen defended by him, they were selected out of another great number objected against the "Apology" in Dr. Harding's confutation, and affirmed still to be lies, and truly objected by him, in his first book of "Detection," from the leaf fifty-nine unto the end of that book. Which treatise being read by me, I found great difficulty how to clear, in all respects, any of the said objected untruths against Mr. Jewell; and then, remembering what the said Dr. Harding often repeateth and urgeth, that Mr. Jewell had chosen those one-and-thirty of the least and easiest to be defended, out of above a thousand, it made me imagine that, if not all, yet most of the other, must needs be held for indefensible by himself; which seemed to me a strange matter, to see that a man of his sort, state, and calling, should cast himself into such straits, if the necessity of his cause did not wholly enforce him.

23. And now, having seen and considered all this, I could willingly have given over, and have passed no further in this search, but that, upon the order and recommendation of my Lord of Canterbury, made unto me, that I should read Mr. Jewell and Mr. Harding together, I, being now entered into perusal of them both, and of divers other before-named Catholic books, written against Mr. Jewell, I was drawn on to persist a little longer, to behold what they said; forsomuch as I perceived that, with universal consent and endeavour, they do not only lay open these particular untruths before mentioned, but do give

Mr. Jewell's
"View of Un-
truths."

Great straits
of Mr. Jewell
in clearing
himself.

Singularity of
false dealing
objected to Mr.
Jewell.

certain strange notes and advertisements of the singular manner of writing of Mr. Jewell in those days, accompanied (as they say) with so many sleights, dissimulations, deceits, and falsities, as it is wonderful to hear and consider, and such, perhaps, as never of any other man was written the like. Whereupon I was greatly troubled, and therefore thought best to set down some particularities thereof in this place, confessing of myself that no one thing did ever move me more to doubt of the truth and sincerity of Protestants' religion, than this their manner of writing, and defending their cause, in so prime, and principal a man as Mr. Jewell was, and always chiefly revered, both by me and others of my calling, that made profession of the gospel in those days. For upon him, next after Holy Scriptures, they are known principally to rely; and that most Protestant writers of our nation do take their manner and method of writing from him, as from the very patriarch of English Protestants.

CHAPTER VII.

What strange Shifts, Sleights, Frauds, Deceits, and other such cunning and artificial Conveyances, the Catholic Writers do object, besides the former particular Untruths, out of Mr. Jewell's Books; and what I found thereof to be true or false.

NEVER man, I ween, that ever preached, taught, or wrote books concerning religion, was charged with so many falsities, subtleties, crafty, and untrue dealings, in his sermons, answers, and replies, as Mr. Jewell, by all the learned sort of his adversaries, hath been; which caused me to take this pain also to examine somewhat in that kind. And first of all about his challenge at Paul's Cross, which was the beginning or first onset of combat between him and them, upon the year 1560, Anno 1560. letting pass all those points, before mentioned, of imputed dissimulation, when he cried out at Paul's Cross, and at the court, *O Gregory! O Augustine! O Jerome! O Leo! O Dionyse!* and the like, and yet afterward, as they say, denied them all, when they made against him. Pretermittting, in like manner, his challenge, *that if they could bring but one scripture, one father, one sentence, yea, two lines in their behalf, he would yield;** which, they say, he never meant. They do add, moreover, that, in the very proposing of his articles, which are twenty-seven in rank, that seem to make a great muster in show, there are not seven of distinct matter in controversy; no, nor scarce half seven; for that the first, being about the *mass*; the third about common prayer in the vulgar tongue; the fourth about the Bishop of Rome; the fourteenth about

* See before, in the fifth chapter.

images ; all the other three-and-twenty be but pieces, and little petty doubts about the first article concerning the mass, name and nature thereof, real presence, single communion, words of consecration, holding up and adoring the sacrament, reservation of the same, dividing it into three parts by the priest when he communicateth, many masses in one day, and other such dependent points ; so as this they hold to be the first, and chief fraud The first and chief fraud. used by him, to make the people believe that he challenged the Catholics upon all, or the chief articles in controversy, when he saith : *These be the highest mysteries, and the greatest keys of their religion*, and yet leaveth out the far greater number of the said controversies, which they call a cunning ostentation of many words with little substance.

2. But afterward, when these articles of his challenge were opened, and answered, by Dr. Harding and others, and Mr. Jewell had made his reply in a very great volume, with a marvellous show of all variety of learning, both in Scriptures, fathers, doctors, histories, lawyers, philosophers, rhetoricians, poets, and the like, the abundant view whereof in the margin with almost infinite quotations did astonish the reader, and terrify at the first sight the Papists, it seeming apparent (as they confess) by the contexture of things there set down, that all or the greatest part of the learnedest Protestants in England had their hands, heads, and labours therein ; then the said Papists, especially those that were banished in Louvain, seeing the greatness of the book, and exceeding store of authorities alleged, laid their heads also, and hands together to answer the same by parts, one taking one piece, and another another, amongst whom Dr. Harding wrote a big book for answer of one article only of the seven-and-twenty proposed, entitling it his "First Rejoinder to Mr. Jewell's Dr. Harding's first Rejoinder. Reply," the which he did with such expedition, as he set forth and printed his book in the very same year that Mr. Jewell had published his large reply, to wit, anno 1566.* In the preface of which book unto the reader are the words before recited of the said Dr. Harding, affirming

* See before, cap. 6.

that by himself, and others that had written against that "Reply" in that very year there were a thousand and odd lies collected, so wilfully made by Mr. Jewell, as he should never be able justly to clear himself, not only of all, but of any of them.

3. Dr. Stapleton also upon that year set forth a great book, called "A Return of Untruths,"* to the same effect, to shew Mr. Jewell's deceitful and fraudulent dealing. In the epistle of which book to Mr. Jewell himself, he hath these words: "In this, your 'Reply,'" saith he, "as you have spared no rhetoric, multiplied allegations, hunted after common-places, entered into digressions, and the like, &c., so have you, for the disgracing of your adversary, used much art; now with scoffs and taunts, now dissembling a great while his meaning, and reasoning sadly against that which no man said, coming in after with, *But Mr. Harding will say, &c.*, then altering quite his text in your 'Reply;' and so confuting at pleasure your own invention, &c. And, as touching your authors and allegations, so ambitiously multiplied throughout your book, and, whereby the simple are much abused, beholding therein a countenance of learning, but not able to descry the covered falsehood, I affirm, that you have falsified, and misalleged the doctors and holy fathers, the decrees of councils, the laws of emperors, the ecclesiastical histories, the schoolmen, and other good writers a number. You have falsified, and mangled the very text of Holy Scripture; namely, St. Paul, in one chapter, nine times, as the reader may see in the third article of his book, folio 107, &c."† This writeth Dr. Stapleton in that place; and then giveth many examples of all these sorts of unfaithful dealing, as of ten ancient fathers, seven historiographers, and seven other good authors, wittingly misalleged, and wilfully corrupted, citing the article and leaf for every one of the same, where they are handled by him. And the same he doth for corruption of councils and laws misalleged, of schoolmen abused, quoting many places for the proof of all he saith, whereof divers I exa-

* Return of Untruths in the Epistle to Mr. Jewell.

† Returns of Untruths, art. 3.

mined, and found them as he alleged, which did greatly cause me to wonder.

4. Then I took Mr. Rastall's book in hand, named "Beware of Mr. Jewell," who had gathered together into one volume, divided into two books, the divers sorts of Mr. Jewell's sleights in this his "Reply," drawing them to different heads, whereof the first was his tergiversation in setting down and defending afterward the true state of the question in all the five articles, wherein he spendeth his whole first book, and giveth many examples, which were overlong here to rehearse, going about to prove thereby that Mr.

Sundry slip-
pery shifts. Jewell was as slippery as an eel, now following one sense, now another in his proposed question.

As, for example, in his second article, the question is, saith Mr. Rastall, whether, within the first six hundred years after Christ, *any communion were ministered unto the people under one kind, or no*; which Mr. Jewell denieth; against which Mr. Harding giveth an instance out of the Ecclesiastical Histories,* of one Serapion, that was communicated on his death-bed under one kind only: Mr. Jewell replieth: *That is not our question; we understand not of private communion, but of public in the church*;† and yet, in the first proposing of this question, there was no mention of the *church, or public*, but whether, without breach of Christ's institution, any man might communicate under one kind only. Then Mr. Jewell is demanded, whether if it may be proved that sick persons have received it under one kind in the church, it will satisfy him? Whereto he answereth, no: saying, "The only thing that I denied is, that ye are not able to bring any one sufficient example, or authority, that ever the whole people received the communion in open church in one kind within that time."‡ Then he is further urged, whether if it can be proved that in close chapels, and oratories, in wildernesses, and caves, in time of persecution, the communion was practised under one kind, this would satisfy him, forsomuch as this proveth Christ's institution, not to forbid

* Euseb. in Hist. Eccles. lib. 6, c. 36. † Mr. Jewell's Reply, p. 134.

‡ Jewell, p. 132.

communion under one kind? But Mr. Jewell leapeth also from this, saying: The question that standeth between us is moved thus, *whether the holy communion were ever ministered openly in the church?* and yet (saith Mr. Rastall) neither *openly* nor *church* were specified in the first question, nor can the place or manner alter the lawfulness of the thing.

5. But then he goeth further to urge him about infants, that they received openly in the church under one kind; but Mr. Jewell replieth thus, altering again the state of his question: *Mr. Harding* (saith he) *maketh his whole plea upon an infant, and yet of infants, as he knoweth, I spake nothing.* And Mr. Rastall answereth, that neither did he speak of *open church, whole people, old men,* or others, but made an universal indefinite negative proposition, *that none within the first six hundred years did ever receive the communion under one kind, nor could not without breach of Christ's institution,** which general negative is overthrown, saith Mr. Rastall, by any one instance, or example to the contrary.

6. Then proceedeth Dr. Harding to urge him with examples of the two disciples, to whom, Christ our Saviour did give the communion, under one kind only, at Emmaus, as by the text of Scripture, and interpretation of ancient fathers, he affirmeth to be plain. He allegeth also the examples of St. Ambrose, and St. Basil, who received the sacrament under one kind, though they were priests; whereto Mr. Jewell answereth, with changing again the state of his question, saying: *This is not to the purpose, for the question is moved of lay people: Mr. Harding bringeth examples of Christ and two disciples, who were of the number of seventy-two, and therefore it may well be thought they were ministers, and not of the lay sort. I demanded of the laity: Mr. Harding answereth of St. Ambrose, and St. Basil, which were bishops.†* So Mr. Jewell: as though if priests, and bishops, and Christ's own disci-

* Luke xxiv, Chrys. Hom. 17, in Matt. ; Aug. de Consensu Evang. l. 3, c. 25, de Serm. 140 de tempore. Theophil. et alii.

† Jewell's Reply, p. 125.

ples, at his own hands, might receive and communicate under one kind, laymen might not.

7. He is urged further, if an example can be brought where the laity and whole people receive openly *under one kind, and in the church*,* would this give satisfaction? Mr. Jewell answereth no, for that he saith, that the point demanded by him is, *that the sacrament was never ministered unto the people under one kind only in any congregation, or in open order, and usage of any church.*† And again: *that it will not follow, that this was the common order of the church:* by which new addition of *common order* and *usage*, the state of the question, saith Mr. Rastall, is again changed, and restrained from the first general proposition thereof at Paul's Cross, and afterwards in writing, which was, *or that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind.* But now *any* will not serve, as you see, but it must be *the whole people*, and those not priests, or bishops, or infants, but lay people, and men and women of years, and this *not privately*, but *in the church and congregation*, and that not seldom, but in *common order, and usage.* And lastly, Mr. Jewell addeth, for another restraint, being pressed thereunto, *as it is now ministered in the Church of Rome*: so as if in any one thing, point, or circumstance or ceremony (saith Mr. Rastall) the administration of the sacrament under one kind be found different now in our days, in the Church of Rome, from that which was used in the first six hundred years after Christ, *though it be* (saith he) *but the difference of a girdle, stole, albe, or amice, the manner of praying, blessing, use of the cross, elevating, communicating, distributing, or the like,* Mr. Jewell is safe from obligation to subscribe, according as he had promised, if his first proposition were proved: for he would still say, that it is not proved in the sense that he meant it, adding still a new sense, when he is pressed by his adversary. This then is the first notable shift which this writer goeth about to prove that Mr. Jewell useth in all the four articles here handled by him,

Shameful
turnings and
windings.

* Rastall, f. 14.

† Jewell, pp. 133 and 143.

changing the state, sense, and meaning of his question, as often as it standeth for his purpose. And of this he giveth many examples in all the said first four articles of Mr. Jewell's challenge.

8. His second sleight he sheweth to be the use and exornation of common-places, when taking some proposition that is common to him, and to his adversary, and granted by them both, and consequently easy to prove, and not needful to be proved, he notwithstanding spendeth long discourses, citeth many authors, reasons, and arguments, to prove the same, making thereby a great ostentation of learning, filling up his margin with multitude of authorities to prove that which is not denied, and deluding oftentimes his simple reader, by making him believe that Mr. Jewell's adversary denieth or doubteth of that which he so earnestly proveth, or that his said adversary holdeth and defendeth the thing which the bishop so diligently impugned, whereas neither of them is true; but that this art is used out of fraud, and want of more pertinent matter (saith Mr. Rastall), and sheweth it by many examples, affirming that in the first half only of Mr. Jewell's large "Reply" for his challenge, he had observed, and gathered out above one hundred such common-places, handled largely by him without all purpose, but only to the fraudulent ends before mentioned.

Second general sleight of Mr. Jewell.

9. But for that he saith, that the number was too great to be handled all in particular, he setteth down only eight-and-thirty,* *not the third part* (as he saith) *of those he had collected*, remitting us to the places themselves, where they are handled by Mr. Jewell; as, for example, this common-place, *that Christ's institution is to be kept in administering sacraments*, being not denied by us, is proved at length by Mr. Jewell, out of St. Paul in divers places, out of St. Matthew's Gospel, out of St. Jerome in sundry works, out of St. Chrysostom, out of St. Cyprian, again and again quoted out of St. Hilary, out of St. Augustine, and of other proofs, which he doth with such vehemency of spirit, as he addeth many indignations, invective

* Rastall, l. 2, fol. 95.

tives, and sharp speeches against Catholics in this matter, as though they could not abide Christ's institution: whereas that point was never called in controversy.

10. Another common-place which Mr. Jewell handleth very largely, both out of fathers, doctors, councils, histories, and other proofs, is this, that the people of old times did communicate with the priest, which Catholics do grant, but not that the priest could not communicate without them; for proof whereof Mr. Jewell allegeth no one word; so as all these proofs of this common-place, saith Mr. Rastall,* are in vain, and only to make up a great book; and he leaveth to our consideration how much paper two hundred of those common-places (for so he maketh his proportion of the whole "Reply," by that which he had gathered out of the one-half) would take up, with matter wholly impertinent, guilefully, and deceitfully handled.

The third general sleight.

11. The third wily sleight which he noteth in Mr. Jewell's writings, is a frequent use of excursions, or voluntary digressions, impertinent to the matter, and only brought in and entertained, followed and pursued, to make his adversary, and his cause odious, contemptible, or ridiculous, whereof Mr. Rastall, out of four articles, only noteth four-and-thirty examples, citing the pages where they are to be found at large:† as, namely, against *clergymen, confession, schoolmen, ceremonies, Bishop of Rome, miracles, cardinals, popes, bishops, priests*, against St. Jerome, Tertullian, Origen, and the like, which occupieth up another great part of his book, and I leave the reader to peruse Mr. Rastall's examples more at large in this matter.

The fourth general sleight.

12. The fourth sleight noted in Mr. Jewell's writings is, that he seemed to have brought divinity unto a rhetorical art of amplification, and witty subtlety, to dispute *pro* and *con* in all matters, whereby a man cometh at length to believe nothing certainly, but to stand upon a certain academical probability in every thing; and that Mr. Jewell practised this, not as a grave divine, but as a light *declamator*, Mr. Rastall proveth it largely, not only by the former common-places, and di-

* Rastall, l. 2, fol. 99.

† Ibid. lib. 20, fol. 100.

gressions, but by his ordinary opposite disputations on both sides, upon different heads;* as, for custom and against custom, for fathers and against fathers, for councils and against councils, for antiquity and against antiquity, for unity and against unity, for ceremonies and against ceremonies, for equality of bishops and against equality, for succession and against succession, for miracles and against miracles, for following the external letter of the Scripture and against following the same, setting down many examples of Mr. Jewell's rhetoric on both parts upon all these several heads; which how profitable an example it may yield to all young divines how to handle matters of religion, and how little these points went to his own heart, Mr. Rastall pondereth much, and leaveth to the reader's consideration.

OF FOUR OTHER SLEIGHTS SET DOWN BY THE SAME
AUTHOR.

Section 1.

AFTER this, Mr. Rastall setteth down other four several sleights, proceeding as it seemeth not so much of art like the former, as of lack of conscience and true meaning; the first whereof is, that he perverteth wittingly and wilfully his adversary's words and true meaning. The second, that he endeavoureth, when otherwise he cannot answer, to disgrace and shift off, by scoffs and jests, authorities and arguments alleged by his said adversary. The third, that he dissembling to understand his adversary's meaning, after much time bestowed in refelling him in a contrary sense, cometh in with a *but*, saying, *but perhaps he will say, that he meaneth, &c.* The fourth is, when fraudulently by establishing one truth, he seeketh maliciously to destroy another, whereas both may, and ought to stand together.

14. Of the first sleight, in perverting his adversary's words and meaning, Mr. Rastall allegeth twenty-nine examples, collected out of the first four articles only of twenty-seven, which in his book may be seen. We shall be content

Examples of
the first sleight
in perverting
his adversary's
words and
meaning.

* Rastall, f. 111.

with two or three. The question being about single communion, to wit, whether one man might receive the communion alone, Dr. Harding allegeth the example of holy Serapion, within the compass of the years prescribed by Mr. Jewell,* and of that example inferred, that for so much as by that example it was evidently lawful in those days to communicate alone, there was private or single communion at that time; but Mr. Jewell maketh his adversary to speak in these words: *Serapion's boy, saith he, ministered the sacrament to his master; ergo, Serapion's boy said private mass.*† Whereas Mr. Harding reasoneth not so, but only that there was private or single communion used, as lawful in those days, whether it were at mass, private or public, or without mass, as the use is also at this day, and consequently Mr. Jewell abuseth much Dr. Harding's argument.

15. A little after that again‡ is handled the matter of Christ's communicating his two disciples at Emmaus under one kind, whereof Dr. Harding's words are these: *And as soon as they knew him in breaking of the bread he vanished away from their sight, ere he took the cup into his hands; which words Mr. Jewell wilfully perverting, crieth out, saying: Oh what miserable straits these men be driven unto, to make up their tale! they are glad to say that Christ lacked leisure. But Christ (saith Dr. Harding)§ straightway vanished from their sight upon the breaking of the bread, and therefore had no leisure to deliver the other portion.* So he; which is a great abuse of Dr. Harding's words, as we see: for that he hath not, that Christ lacked leisure, or was in haste, &c., but that this is odiously put in by Mr. Jewell.

16. In like manner, Dr. Harding, alleging an example out of the Ecclesiastical History, that one Simeon lying sick and feeble, and demanding to be houseled, or to receive the communion, the arch-priest Bassus washed his mouth first, "which had not been needful," saith Mr. Harding, "if he should have received the holy cup." This speech Mr. Jewell draweth to an argument in these

* Rastall, f. 127.

† Rastall, f. 130.

‡ Jewell's Reply, f. 46.

§ Jewell, p. 127.

words:* *The sick man's mouth was dry; ergo, he could not receive the cup: who would make such reasons, but Mr. Harding?* Whereto Mr. Rastall answereth, "that any man may make them, if they be feigned and devised in his name, as these are by Mr. Jewell against Dr. Harding."

17. A long and grievous complaint is made by Mr. Jewell against Dr. Harding, for that he having alleged many authorities of ancient fathers, as St. Jerome, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, Arnobius, Ambrose, Augustine, and others, all was answered only, as he saith, with these words: *What then?* Whereupon he amplifieth greatly this matter, saying: *Thinketh Mr. Harding that the authorities of so many holy fathers is so light as that he is able to blow them all away with these two vain syllables—What then?* But to this is answered that immediately after *what then?* ensue, in Mr. Harding, these words: *No man denieth you this* (which you prove out of the fathers): and if Mr. Jewell had not guiltily cut off these words, he had had no matter to expostulate or amplify upon: for the cause was, that Mr. Jewell's alleging many fathers and authorities to prove that which Mr. Harding denieth not (according to the use of his former common-places), Mr. Harding answered him, as Mr. Rastall relateth, *What then? no man denieth this:* that which you go about to prove.

18. Again, Mr. Harding, writing of the Latin service, saith: "If our new masters will condemn the Latin service in the Latin Church, for that the unlearned people understand it not, then they must also condemn, for a great part, the English service, which the common people, for the greatest part of the Scriptures read therein, do not understand." But this argument of Mr. Harding is thus related by Mr. Jewell:† *Mr. Harding saith that the people is gross and simple, and cannot understand the Scriptures by hearing the same in the mother tongue; ergo, they must hear it pronounced in the Latin tongue: this seemeth to be a very simple argument.* So he. And so it is indeed, by the fraud of the propounder. But if it had been pro-

* Jewell, p. 134.

† Jewell's Reply, p. 214.

pounded simply as it lieth in Mr. Harding, it would not have appeared so simple, saith Mr. Rastall.*

19. Again, Mr. Harding, writing of the necessity of one visible and sensible head over the Church, which is one visible and sensible body, saith thus: "That mankind dependeth most of sense, and receiveth all learning and instruction of sensible things; therefore, notwithstanding Christ be the chief head, yet because he liveth not visible amongst us, the Church hath need of some man to be his governor, whom she may perceive by outward sense, whether it be the Bishop of Rome, or whosoever." This argument Mr. Jewell relateth thus:† *Mr. Harding saith that mankind dependeth most of sense; ergo, the Pope is head of the Universal Church: here is a very unsensible argument* (saith Mr. Jewell), *nor sense, nor reason can make it good.* Whereto is replied by Mr. Rastall,‡ that a little truth and honesty in the relator would have made it good enough, if it had been related as Mr. Harding left it. And these examples shall be sufficient for this sleight of wilfully perverting his adversary's words and meaning.

20. The other that followeth, of shifting off Examples of the second sleight in scoffing. by scoffs the allegations or authorities that otherwise he cannot answer, have many examples also alleged by Mr. Rastall, as namely, for example, fol. 142 of his book, entitled, "Beware of Mr. Jewell." First, whereas Dr. Harding had alleged the authority of Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium, concerning the life and miracles of St. Basil, and Mr. Jewell would seem to call the same in doubt; Mr. Harding, coming to prove the same, allegeth, among other things, that this treatise is to be seen in the library of St. Nazarius, in the city of Verona, in Italy, written in vellum (or parchment), for three hundred years past, bearing the name of Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium. To this Mr. Jewell answereth in these words: *A calf's skin is no sufficient warrant of truth.*§

The second example. 21. Again, Mr. Harding reciting an example out of Venerable Bede, of one Cedmon, a devout man, that made songs (saith Bede) containing matter

* Rastall, f. 137. † Jewell, p. 257. ‡ Rastall, f. 159. § Jewell, p. 36.

of the Holy Scripture, with such exceeding sweetness, and with such a grace, that many feeling their hearts compunct, and pricked with hearing and reading of them, withdrew themselves from the love of the world. Which words of Venerable Bede being alleged by Dr. Harding, Mr. Jewell answereth thus : *I little thought Mr. Harding would not so much have bewrayed his want, as to prove this matter by pipers and poets.**

22. Moreover, Dr. Harding, treating of sole communion, and that it was not against ^{The third ex- ample.} Christ's institution to receive alone, when there is no company, he putteth the case, if in time of some great sickness, four or five in their beds should desire to receive, and that neither the priest were able, nor others willing to communicate with them, may not these (saith he) receive severally ? To which demand Mr. Jewell answereth thus : *Alas ! must Mr. Harding leave all the old doctors and holy fathers, and beg at death's door to get somewhat to help his mass ?* Whereto is replied, that, besides the scoff, there is a manifest falsehood ; for that this example is not brought in to prove the mass, but single communion

* Jewell, p. 189. Rastall, f. 149. [The reader will be better able to appreciate the unseemliness of this scoff after reading the following extract from Venerable Bede. "Cedmon was wont to make pious and religious verses, so that whatever was interpreted to him out of Scripture, he soon after put the same into poetical expressions of much sweetness and humility in English, which was his native language. Others after him attempted, in the English nation, to compose religious poems, but none could ever compare with him, for he did not learn the art of poetry from men but from God ; for which reason he never would compose any trivial or vain poem, but only those which relate to religion suited his religious tongue. . . . He sang the creation of the world, the origin of man, and all the history of Genesis, and made many verses on the departure of the Children of Israel out of Egypt, &c. . . the incarnation, passion, resurrection of our Lord, and his ascension into heaven ; the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the preaching of the apostles ; also the terror of future judgment, the horror of the pains of hell, and the delights of heaven, &c."—One word on the death of this just man, so circumstantially narrated by the same venerable writer. "As he had served God with a simple and pure mind, and undisturbed devotion, so he now departed to his presence, leaving the world by a quiet death ; and that tongue which had composed so many holy words in praise of the Creator, uttered its last words whilst he was in the act of signing himself with the cross, and recommending himself into his hands."—Bede, Eccl. Hist. iv. 24, Giles's edition.]

The fourth example. sometimes to be lawful and necessary. And whereas Mr. Harding allegeth the ancient holy father, St. Basil, reporting that they which lived in mountains, wildernesses, and in Egypt, had the communion at home, and kept it with themselves, and received it privately, &c., Mr. Jewell answereth thus: *Verily if Mr. Harding could find any thing in the Church, he would not thus hunt the mountains, neither would he fly for aid into Egypt, if he could find any near at home.**

23. Again, Mr. Harding proved, out of the testimony of Leontius, Bishop of Cyprus, that John, the holy patriarch of Alexandria, said mass, and received alone;† Mr. Jewell answereth thus: *A strait case for Mr. Harding to run to Alexandria, a thousand miles beyond all Christendom, to seek his mass, and that not in open church neither, but in private oratories.* Whereto is replied, that

The fifth example. Alexandria at that time was also Christian, and that the patriarch thereof being a famous holy man, his saying mass, and receiving alone in his oratory, which is here granted, proveth that the thing was not held unlawful, or contrary to Christ's institution, in those days. So as the *strait case* seemeth to fall out on Mr. Jewell's side, not being able otherwise to solve the argument than by this scoff of *running beyond all Christendom.*

Examples of the third sleight in dissembling his adversary's meaning.

24. For the other sleight of dissembling to understand his adversary's meaning, and coming in afterward with a *But you will say, &c.*, one or two examples shall suffice. Dr. Harding having to treat of private mass, and sole receiving, for impugning the first article of Mr. Jewell's challenge, thought best first to establish, by manifold testimonies of the fathers, that there was a mass, and external sacrifice of the New Testament, to be believed of Christians; meaning afterward to pass to the proper question of private mass, and sole receiving; and therefore alleged almost all the rank of the ancient fathers to prove that there is an external sacrifice, appointed by Christ to be used in the

* Jewell, p. 138.

† Rastall, f. 143.

church; which Mr. Jewell seeing, he guilefully bestoweth three whole leaves of his book to shew that these authorities did not directly prove the question of private mass, and sole receiving; and after those three leaves so spent in triumphing against him, he cometh in with his *but*, saying: *But Mr. Harding will say, he allegeth all these doctors to another purpose; that is, to prove the sacrifice, &c.*, which he knew well enough before, but that he dissembled the matter to give himself somewhat to speak of, saith Mr. Rastall, for that he had heard Dr. Harding affirm expressly, that he alleged those fathers only for proof of the daily sacrifice of the church in general, and not for single communion, which Mr. Jewell calleth private mass: for which also he addeth this reason, *for that albeit Mr. Jewell pretended enmity against private mass in word, yet indeed he extended his whole wit to abolish the unbloody and holy sacrifice of the church*: and then, further, after his authorities alleged for proof of sacrifice, he concludeth in these words: *Now, this presupposed, that the mass standeth upon good and sufficient grounds, let us come to our special purpose, and say somewhat of private mass.** How then could Mr. Jewell so mistake him, and come in with his *But he will say,†* forsomuch as he had said it, and repeated it so plainly before? Is not this a plain shift?

25. Many like examples may be alleged of this dissimulation, as whereas Dr. Harding, citing a plain place out of St. Irenæus for the ^{The second ex-ample.} principality of the Church of Rome in his time, saying, *that it is necessary that all churches do repair and resort to this, for the greater principality thereof:‡* and then another authority out of St. Ambrose, affirming to be in that city, *apostolici sacerdotii principatum,§*—"the principality of the apostolic priesthood"—Mr. Jewell to the first authority, as though it had made nothing to the purpose, frameth a long excursion, to shew against what heresy

* Harding, p. 24. † Jewell, p. 12. ‡ Irenæus, lib. 3, cap. 5.

§ Ambrose De Voc. Gent. lib. 2, cap. 16. [Although both Harding (Answer to Jewell's Challenge, p. 80) and Jewell ascribe this work to St. Ambrose, it is certainly the production of a more recent father, perhaps of St. Prosper or St. Leo.]

St. Irenæus did write, and why he commended so much Rome, and that he meaneth nothing of *supremacy*. And after much ado about this, the force of the objection being as it were forgotten, and his reader's mind diverted from the matter, he cometh in with his ordinary *but* in these words: *But they will reply, that Irenæus saith, propter maiorem principalitatem*, all Christian churches must repair to Rome for the greater principality thereof; which he shifteth off as a matter of small moment, knowing well enough that therein stood the principal force of the argument, and that it was brought not by way of reply to a former answer, but as the first, and chief proof of the principal question. And is not this a deluding of the reader?

The third example.

26. And, in like manner, to the other places of St. Ambrose, after Mr. Jewell had, for a show, discoursed at large of the ancient dignity, worthiness, and renown of the Church of Rome; confirming also the same by the testimonies of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom, concerning her zeal and ancient purity, but not for her principality of apostolic priesthood, he cometh in with his accustomed *but*, saying: * *But St. Ambrose saith, apostolici sacerdotii principatum*, that Rome hath the principality of the apostolic priesthood; as though he had forgotten before that the chief strength of the authority standeth in these words, which now, by way of a slight objection, he would slenderly shift off: but every man seeth the deceit, and therefore I will say no more thereof.

27. There remaineth then, to give an example or two of the last shift, or refelling one truth by another, whereof Mr. Rastall allegeth twelve examples,† but all are too many for this place; these few that follow shall suffice. Mr. Harding, for proof of communicating under one kind, allegeth the authority of St. Irenæus, which saith the custom to have been in his days, that when bishops came to Rome, the eucharist was sent unto them in token of their union in religion; whereunto Mr. Jewell, answering, saith,‡ that St. Paulinus sent also a loaf of bread to St. Augustine, and with this thinketh that he hath answered the matter.

Examples of the fourth sleight in refelling one truth by another.

* p. 248.

† Rastall, f. 156.

‡ Jewell, p. 40.

But, saith Mr. Rastall, both may be true, and one not overthrow the other; for that the bread sent by St. Paulinus to St. Augustine, in token of mutual friendship, being common bread, and not the eucharist, answereth not the force of Mr. Harding's argument, that speaketh of the eucharist and sacrament.

28. Again, Mr. Harding, treating of the Pope's supremacy, alleged these words of our Saviour to St. Peter: *Thou art a rock, and upon this rock will I build my church.** Whereto Mr. Jewell, answering, saith: *Christ is the rock, and upon Christ is built the church.* Which is not denied, but rather both are true; neither the establishing of the one ought to overthrow the other. So, in like manner, Dr. Harding alleging an authority of St. Augustine to Pope Bonifacius, where he saith that the Church of Rome had *principatum sedis apostolicæ*—"the principality of the apostolic see." And against these words: *Who is he that knoweth not* (saith St. Augustine) *that principality of apostleship is to be preferred before any other bishopric?†* Mr. Jewell answereth by this sleight: *Socrates is called Prince of Philosophers, and Plato Prince of Orators, and Pompeius Prince of the World, and Elias Head of the Prophets; in which place princeps is taken, not for a head, or governor, but only for a man that, for his qualities, is to be esteemed above the rest; and in this sense St. Augustine calleth the See of Rome, as it was in his time, principatum sedis apostolicæ, the principality of the see apostolic.‡* So Mr. Jewell; purposing to overthrow one truth by affirming the other, as Mr. Rastall noteth, for that no man denieth but that sometimes the word *princeps* and *principatus* may be so taken, but not always; nor in the sense of St. Augustine, who speaketh of the eminency and principality of the See Apostolic of Rome above other bishops' sees: and so it will appear to him that shall read the place; and that this answer of Mr. Jewell indeed is but mere evasion.

* Matt. xvi.

† August. de Bapt. contra Donatist. lib. ii. n. 2. [Quis enim nescit illum apostolatus principatum cuilibet episcopatus præferendum?—To the same effect a few lines before: . . . apostolum Petrum in quo primatus apostolorum tam excellenti gratia præeminet.]

‡ Jewell, p. 149.

CHAPTER VIII.

How besides these escapes of Master Jewell, observed and objected by others, I had noted also divers myself, by reading his Works, which I could not well answer or excuse: as neither some other alleged by Mr. Rastall, who objecteth thirteen several chapters of divers sorts of falsities.

THESE foresaid eight heads then of sleights and slippery conveyances are noted by the foresaid authors concerning Mr. Jewell's unsincere dealing, both in word and writing, which I, conferring with the books themselves, took marvellous great dislike thereof, and of myself did note three other heads not so distinctly observed by Mr. Rastall, though set down by another of that religion, and very familiar sometimes both in acquaintance with Mr. Rastall, and in diligent reading of his books, whom presently we shall cite. The first of these two heads is the ordinary false citing of his adversary's words and text, cutting off, and adding, leaving out, skipping over, piecing and tying together, as it best made to his purpose; yet pretending to the reader as though he set down his words wholly, where I confess that I found myself also deceived when I came to examine Dr. Harding's true text. And for that it would be over long to allege particular examples of this, the reader may be referred to Dr. Harding's last book, called the "Detection." But yet I cannot pretermit to set down the words of the other foresaid witness, which was at that time an earnest Protestant preacher, and, as before you have heard, of some familiarity also with Mr. Rastall himself, who, having read with much attention and judgment Mr. Jewell's books, amongst all other sleights, observed principally

A pernicious
sleight in Mr.
Jewell.

this, which he testifieth afterward in print, writing as followeth.*

2. "Mr. Jewell, among many false practices, used this as one very apt to beguile the simple, and whereby I think at this present very many learned men are deceived, that is, from the discourse of his adversary he would cut out and remove from the sight of the reader the principal strength, were it Scripture, councils, fathers, or reason, whereby the adversary justified his cause, and after shuffle up some odd talk and impertinent allegations against the rest. For example, let the 'Defence of the Apology of the English Church' serve, where is no matter seriously handled, from the first beginning to the last line of the book, but the very pith and most forcible parts, as it were, the joints and sinews, are thus taken away and left out of the book, sometimes whole and many pages together, sometimes half-pages, sometimes four or five lines in a side, sometimes whole sentences or pieces of sentences, according as he thought requisite for the bettering of his cause and disgracing of his adversary; and yet, notwithstanding, he pieceth and patcheth up the rest, as though it were the full and perfect discourse of Dr. Harding. This is as much as if some bragging Thraso, appointed to combat with his enemy, should at the time of fight cause his enemy to be tied up in prison, and shew his chivalry upon a man made of clouts. This is, instead of a body to fight with a shadow. I will not exemplify this by any particularity, because I can assure the reader by certain experience, let him in that book fall upon what place he list, he shall hardly miss an example." Thus Mr. William Reynolds of his own experience, which did not a little move and induce me to seek further.

3. The other head of sleights observed is The second sort of sleights by disgracing ancient fathers. concerning the disgracing or shifting off the ancient fathers when they make against him, wherein though great multitude of examples may be given,

* Mr. William Reynolds, in his Refutation of Mr. Whitaker, in the preface, p. 75. [The conversion of Reynolds to the Catholic faith is said to have been occasioned by his close examination of Jewell's works. A highly interesting memoir of him will be found in Dodd, ii. 65, folio ed.]

for that not only Mr. Rastall, Dr. Harding, Dr. Stapleton, Dr. Sanders, and others, have collected many ; yet shall I touch one or two more, setting down the words collected and noted by myself out of Mr. Jewell's own book ; and they are these, treating of the marriages of priests and votaries, in which matter, finding the said fathers, and namely, St. Chrysostom and Augustine, to speak somewhat sharply against him therein, finally he concludeth thus : * *Divers of the holy fathers* (saith he) *have written over basely, I will not say wildly and slanderously, of the state of matrimony in general, calling it, in all kind of men, fornication and an evil thing, and like to adultery ; therefore, I say, they may much less be taken as indifferent judges in priests' marriages.* And a little before that again : † *Good reader,* saith he, *these words that the fathers have used against marriage of votaries, calling it worse than adultery, incest, sacrilege, and the like, have proceeded more of a zeal and heat of mind, than of profound consideration and judgment of the cause : neither must we always strain such sayings to the utmost. For whereas St. Augustine saith, such marriage is worse than adultery, he saith nevertheless immediately after, in the same place : It is true and very marriage indeed before God and man, and no adultery.*

4. Thus he : and his answer or shifting off in this manner seemed to me, upon the examination of the places themselves, to be very injurious and opprobrious to the said fathers, both in that he maketh them to say that which they do not (to wit, *that matrimony is, in all kind of men, fornication and an evil thing, and like to adultery*), which I could never find in them, as also that they write basely and vilely thereof, which is most false. For first, I found that St. Augustine wrote a whole book purposely *De Bono Conjugii*, of the goodness or good estate of marriage, where he accounteth of it as good and goodly, chaste and honest ; opposing it to all fornication and uncleanness, as among wellnigh infinite places in the said book, and in other of his works, these his words do evidently declare : *Non igitur duo mala sunt connubium et fornicatio, quorum alterum pejus : sed duo bona sunt con-*

* Jewell, Defence of the Apology, fol. 222.

† Ibid. fol. 215.

*nubium et continentia, quorum alterum melius.** Marriage, then, and fornication (saith St. Augustine) are not two evil things, whereof the one is worse than the other, but marriage and continency (or single life) are two good things, whereof the one is the better (to wit, continency).

And again, in the same place, he saith: *We praise and commend the goodness of Susanna, in conjugal castitate—in her chastity of marriage state—but yet we prefer before the same the goodness of the widow Anna, and much more of the Virgin Mary.* So that I could not but conceive a very strange opinion both of Mr. Jewell and his works, after I had descried in him this drift and sinister intention among many others to leave this imprinted in the mind of his reader, that the fathers were but men and subject to their passions, wherewith they were sometimes so far overruled and misled, according to the current of their times, to speak so much in the commendation of virginity, as at last to contemn and despise, and speak vilely and slanderously of honest matrimony, being the holy ordinance of God himself. For by this general rule, or answering in this sort, all authority of the fathers and of the church of Christ in their days, whereof they were chief pillars, may be cut off, or discredited in any thing whatsoever.

Now continency and virginity are preferred before marriage by St. Augustine.

5. And, surely, this did so much the more mislike me, in that I considered with myself how this his strange and opprobrious report of divers holy fathers, as he also calleth them, could not with any colour of truth be verified of any one, for aught that ever I could read or find. And as for St. Jerome, at whom Mr. Jewell, as I guess, did chiefly aim in this matter of votaries' marriages (for I remember Mr. Calvin also saith, *that divers holy fathers, except Jerome, did not with so great spitefulness deface the honesty of marriage*),† albeit writing against the heretic Jovinian, he is sometimes sharp in condemning all marriage of votaries, and vowed priests, and religious women; yet speaketh he not a word in derogation of marriage itself, nor reprehendeth, but well alloweth, not only single or

* Augustine, De Bono Conjugii. † Calvin, Inst. lib. 4, c. 12, sect. 28.

once marrying, but the often marriages also of those that have not vowed single life, nor made any promise to God to the contrary. His words be these: *Non damno bigamos, imo nec trigamos, et si dici potest octogamos, &c.**—"I do not condemn those that marry twice, nor those that marry thrice, no nor those that marry eight times, if there may be found any such."

6. I seeing this then, and yet remembering how confidently Mr. Jewell did appeal to the ancient fathers in his foresaid challenge, provoking the Papists to bring forth but one father, one doctor, one sentence against any one of his articles, I did greatly marvel at this manner of proceeding, especially reading in another place those words generally spoken by him:† *As for their religion, if it be of so long continuance as they would have men ween it is, why do they not prove it so by the examples of the primitive church, and by the fathers and councils of old times? Why lieth so ancient a cause thus long in the dust destitute of an advocate?* So he, very confidently as you see. But whether his heart did think as he speaketh, it seemed now to me very doubtful.

The three sort
of sleights in
defacing his ad-
versaries.

7. Another head of unsincere dealing, which shall be the last I mean to touch in this place, seemed to me, in reading over his books, to be the small, or no scruple at all, that he had in speaking and writing opprobriously of his adversaries, and this in such things oftentimes, as either he must be presumed to be very ignorant, which easily cannot be granted, or that he did without respect of conscience rush into divers and sundry calumniations, which he knew to be false, especially against the Popes and Bishops of Rome, who though they in the cause of religion were his adversaries, yet could not they be belied, in my judgment, without grievous sin. For if detraction and injurious infamation wilfully intended even towards private and poor men is held for damnable without repentance, and detested by all good men of upright conscience, how much more towards so great a personage as the Pope is among those of his religion! Whereas the devil himself is not wilfully to be belied, as our

* Jerome, lib. 1, contra Jovinian.

† Jewell, par. 5.

English proverb saith, but much less by a bishop in open auditory, and upon mature deliberation in print. As, for example, in his "Apology," where he protesteth to deal sincerely, and to injure no man; out of which, notwithstanding, I noted so many passionate speeches, both rash and violent, as they seemed to me, that I wondered how he could utter them, and much more suffer them to go forth to the sight and hearing of others, especially forso-much as Dr. Harding, in his answer to that part of the "Apology," doth convince them all by good and substantial witnesses to be false, feigned, or exaggerated.

8. As, for example, the hurling under his table, by the Pope, of Francis Dandalus, Duke of Venice, King of Crete and Cyprus, fast bound with chains, &c.; wherein Dr. Harding noteth five manifest lies, as before hath been shewed.* That Pope Celestinus did, with his foot, put on the imperial crown upon the head of the emperor Henry VI., and with the same foot cast it off again.† That Pope Innocent III. did monstrously put the neck of the Emperor Frederick under his feet,‡ with the verse of the psalm *Super aspidem et basiliscum, &c.* That Pope Liberius did favour the Arians in his days.§ That Pope Zosimus corrupted the Council of Nice in his time. That Pope John XXII. denied the immortality of the soul, and many other such personal things against the Popes, affirmed by Mr. Jewell with great asseveration, and yet reproved by Mr. Harding for manifest untruths; all which, after I had examined them and found them as was objected, made such an impression in me as I could not tell what to think, or whether any conscience were respected in these

* See page 189, *supra*.

† Ibid. f. 187.

‡ Ibid. f. 188. [Harding's answer to this deserves to be quoted. "Ye ask, *Who* put the Emperor Frederick's neck under his feet? &c. Verily, who it was I know not, *neither yourselves, I believe.* In the margin of your lady's translation [Anne Bacon's], and in your Latin book first printed in London, I find the name of Innocent III. : in that of your man's translation, Innocentius VIII. is noted. Your Latin books printed among the Hugonots of France have the name of *Alexander III.* So it appeareth you know not who it was."—It should be observed, that it is Jewell's fashion to insinuate a falsehood by an interrogation. Thus, "*Who* hurled under his table Francis Dandalus?" The same figure of speech may be noticed in the homily cited p. 190, *note*.]

§ Ibid. f. 284.

things or no, seeing these assertions of Mr. Jewell so clearly proved to be false.

9. And now all these sleights, or the greater part thereof (excepting such as I noted myself), were observed and collected, as hath been shewed, by Mr. Rastall and others, out of the only sermon or challenge made by Mr. Jewell, and his "Reply" for the same unto Mr. Harding's answer thereof, which answer while it was in making, Mr. Jewell penned and published the "Apology of the Church of England," both in Latin and English, whereof Mr. Harding having made a confutation, Mr. Jewell returned his "Defence" thereof in a great volume, as hath been said; against which Mr. Harding directed his "Detection," wherein, besides the thousand and odd untruths, wherewith Mr. Jewell was charged before by Dr. Harding, Dr. Stapleton, Dr. Sanders, and others, as the said Dr. Harding setteth down in his epistle to the first rejoinder, gathered only out of the challenge and reply; a huge number of others are also objected to out of his other two books, to wit, the "Apology" and "Defence" thereof. Insomuch as out of the "Apology" only the foresaid Mr. Rastall hath gathered thirteen chapters of divers sorts of lies, which I will set down in his own words, out of his treatise, entitled "False Wares packed up by Mr. Jewell in his Apology."

Thirteen other chapters of Mr. Jewell's lies gathered by Mr. Rastall.

10. *The first chapter (saith he) containeth the false and naughty arguments of the "English Apology;" the second, the absurdities thereof; the third, the lies in telling of stories; the fourth, the lies upon the ancient fathers; the fifth, the lies upon councils; the sixth, the lies upon the Scriptures; the seventh, the flat lies; the eighth, the rhetorical lies; the ninth, the examples of facing a lie; the tenth, the problematical lies; the eleventh, a blasphemous lie; the twelfth, contradictions; the thirteenth, false interpretations.*

11. These are the arguments of Mr. Rastall's chapters in that treatise, which are full of many examples over long to be related here. And these were gathered, as hath been said, before Mr. Jewell's book of "Defence" came forth. But after the said "Defence," or rather some small part

thereof, had been overlooked by Mr. Dr. Harding, in his "Detection,"* there came forth another new catalogue of Mr. Jewell's false dealing, containing twenty-six places of Mr. Harding's text wilfully left out, and cut off purposely by Mr. Jewell, where most it made against him in his said "Defence," as also of one hundred and fifty-two shameless and notorious lies, as Mr. Harding calleth them, citing both the leaf and line where they are to be found.

Twenty-six new lies: one hundred and fifty-two other lies.

12. And with this shall I end this chapter, growing now to be weary. But here I noted by the way, that the Catholics in this conflict had the last act or action; for that Mr. Jewell, for aught I can learn, never answered Mr. Harding's two Rejoinders to his "Reply," the one to the first article, the other to the fourth following of the twenty-seven of his Challenge: nor did ever answer to the same doctor's book of "Detection" against the "Defence of the Apology," nor yet to the "Return of Untruths" of Dr. Stapleton, nor to the two works of Dr. Sanders in the same conflict; so as the Catholics, remaining with the last parts in both those combats of that time, do persuade themselves that they had also the victory; adding further, that according to those proofs which here have been mentioned, the Protestants' first and chief English captain, Mr. Jewell (for so they hold him), hath been proved and demonstrated to have been the falsest man, and of most deceitful sleights and unconscionable shifts of any man that ever took pen in hand concerning matters of conscience and religion; which point, I confess, struck much fear in me, and made me reflect upon divers matters that I had never thought of before, imagining with myself, that if so principal a man, by whose chief help, labours, learning, and credit, the Protestant religion in England was first planted, spread, defended, and maintained in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and is continued yet in many men's hearts and affections, by the credit and opinion they hold of that man and his writings (among whom I confess myself also

The Catholics had the last hand of Mr. Jewell.

What cogitations I had upon Mr. Jewell's manner of false writing discovered.

* Dr. Harding's Detection, fol. 415.

to have been one), and that now examining the same man's writings, it be found that he wrote with so much passion, lightness, and small substance of truth, yea, with wilful rashness and witting unsincerity, as by so many examples before mentioned it seemeth to appear; what shall become of my soul, thought I, that so long hath followed this man's direction? and yet there came another cogitation presently (I being loath to yield to this), perhaps he hath answered, or was able to answer, these falsities laid against him. Whereupon I resolved to discuss this point in like manner, as far as I could find any thing alleged for excuse thereof; and for that cause did I take a new labour in hand for his better justification, if it might be, which the reader shall see in the next ensuing chapter.

CHAPTER IX.

The Justification which Mr. Jewell endeavoureth to make of divers of the foresaid Falsities, Deceits, and Corruptions objected against him; and how I examined the same for my better satisfaction, but could little or nothing be satisfied therein; and consequently I remained more doubtful and perplexed than before.

WHEREAS after the consideration of so many objected untruths and false manners of proceeding, as before I had seen and perused, my only refuge remained to see how Mr. Jewell, in his last book at least, had gone about to discharge himself thereof, and to yield some satisfaction to the reader's conscience concerning his truth and fidelity in proceeding; I took greedily this matter in hand, and repaired to a certain small treatise or table set down by him in the end of his "Defence of the Apology," entitled "A View of Untruths objected by the Papists" against Mr. Jewell, and there briefly answered by him; which view, when I had looked over, I found only therein one-and-thirty objected untruths presented to be answered. The first fifteen, as before also hath been noted, taken out of his "Reply" to Dr. Harding, against which "Reply," as oftentimes I have had occasion to touch, there were, by divers authors, above one thousand untruths objected, and Dr. Harding, in his first Rejoinder to the said "Reply," and to the first article only of twenty-seven, setteth down two hundred and twenty-four distinct untruths, which he defendeth to be wilful and witting, and proveth the same by so many reasons and authorities, as I found not myself able fully to answer or excuse any one of them. As for the second Rejoinder to the other four articles (for only five were handled in all this combat), I could not get

to peruse, but instead of him I found Dr. Stapleton, in his "Return of Untruths," to object five hundred and sixty-one lies out of the said "Reply," of the same quality, with like abundance of proofs; out of all which number now I found Mr. Jewell to make profession of answering only to fifteen, and that in such manner and order as now we shall declare.

2. And first I thought with myself, that to answer fifteen for a thousand was a small proportion, especially his adversary, Dr. Harding, objecting that he had chosen out the least and most easy to be defended, adding further, that to nine also of these fifteen he answered nothing at all, thinking them belike to be small as they were not worthy to be answered: the other six he answereth, but so as Dr. Harding returneth them upon him again, as may appear in the first book of his "Detection;" as, for example, where Gregory VII. is said by Mr. Jewell to have wrought necromancy and sorcery, and that this is reported by grave and indifferent writers, Mr. Harding noted it for an untruth. Mr. Jewell defendeth it with the testimony of Benno Cardinalis* and Uspergensis.† Mr. Harding sheweth they were partial and in schism against him with the emperor, and proveth the contrary by a great multitude of the most ancient writers that ever lived in that time with him or soon after, as Marianus Scotus, Lambertus Schafnaburgensis, Leo Ostiensis, Otho Frisingensis, Platina, and others.

3. The like controversy is about the death of the Emperor Henry of Luxemburg, whom Mr. Jewell affirming to have been poisoned in the communion bread, and Pope Victor in the chalice; which, as Mr. Jewell seeketh to defend, by some authors, so his adversary, Mr. Harding, reproveth it by more, and yet confesseth that only in these three untruths

The combat between Mr. Jewell and Mr. Harding about untruths.

* [Benno was made cardinal by the Antipope Clement III. His history of Gregory VII. is the bitter satire of an enemy, and is contradicted by the testimony of contemporary documents. See Cardinal Gotti, in his Colloquies, p. 150 et seq., and Mr. Bowden's Life of Gregory.]

† [Conrad of Lichtenaw, Abbot of Ursburg. He died in 1240. His "Chronicle" is a rhapsodical production, and very probably has been interpolated.]

he hath some pretence of defence, by the variable relation of divers authors: but in two or three other that do ensue about the testimony of Lyra, falsely cited by Mr. Jewell, about feigned miracles to be wrought by priests in the church, he can no ways defend himself from wilful corruption. And, in truth, when I read the place itself in Lyra, and considered the purpose, and circumstances of his intention and whole discourse, I could not find how to excuse Mr. Jewell from manifest perverting him indeed; for he doth not say that which Mr. Jewell affirmeth him to say, either in words or sense.

4. And this being all that Mr. Jewell taketh upon him to satisfy out of all that great and huge number of untruths objected, and these few being answered so slenderly as now you have heard, I began to bless myself, and so passed over to the other sixteen which were of the number of those objected out of the "Apology," and "Defence" thereof, about which we have heard now thirteen whole chapters of untruths and false dealing to have been collected by Mr. Rastall, and an hundred and fifty-two several untruths set down by Mr. Harding in his "Detection." But now, casting mine eyes over these said sixteen, which Mr. Jewell taketh upon him to defend, I found none of all those eighteen which before, in the fifth and sixth chapters,* I have set down as seriously objected against Mr. Jewell, either named or answered; except one only, which is the fifth in rank, about the third Council of Carthage falsified; and whereat I marvelled wonderfully, for it seemed to me an evident sign that he could not answer the rest.

The third Council of Carthage falsified.

5. The solution also given to this I found to be such, as it much confirmed me in my opinion that both this and all the rest of untruths objected before were unanswerable; for Mr. Jewell's words are these in his "Apology," as before hath been set down: *The old Council of Carthage commanded nothing to be read in Christ's congregation but the canonical Scriptures;*† which words, when I went to read and examine in the council itself, I found divers things

* See p. 173 et seq.

† Jewell's Apology, part 5, c. 3, div. 2.

fraudulently left out: as first, these words, *sub nomine divinarum Scripturarum*—"nothing must be read in the church under the name of divine Scripture, but that which is canonical:" then also is left out the express exception of the council itself, *that it is lawful also to read the passions of martyrs in the church upon their festival days*: thirdly, also is dissembled that the books of Machabees, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, and others refused by the Protestants, are there set down by the council to be canonical Scripture. Now then, I expected what Mr. Jewell would answer to all these points.

Mr. Jewell's
weak excuse.

6. To these points Mr. Jewell, coming to answer, findeth no other refuge or excuse, but to say, that he cited his text according to the abbreviation of the Council of Hippo, which hath this style of the 30th canon: *What are the canonical Scriptures that are to be read, and besides which none are to be read?* which words do help nothing Mr. Jewell, for this is but the title of a canon of the Council of Hippo (whereof St. Augustine was bishop) collected, and ordered in the foresaid third Council of Carthage, wherein St. Augustine was also present. And forsomuch as the said Council of Hippo is not now extant, the foresaid titles or heads of the chapters or canons thereof, to the number of one hundred and forty-one, are set down in the book of councils, immediately after the Council of Carthage: so as this title alleged by Mr. Jewell relateth only briefly, or by abbreviation, as the words are, what was handled in the said 30th canon of Hippo, which was the same that we have cited before, out of the 47th canon of the Council of Carthage, so as this, in my opinion, relieveth the cause of Mr. Jewell nothing at all, but rather aggravateth the same. For, whereas the foresaid title sheweth which are the canonical Scriptures that are to be read, and besides which none are to be read, it is evident that it meaneth as the Council of Carthage itself expoundeth, *sub nomine divinarum Scripturarum*, "under the name of divine Scriptures;" so as Mr. Jewell being convinced to have dealt guilefully in three different points of this one allegation, it made me imagine how impossible it were unto him to satisfy all the

rest. And, moreover, I noted how he, having produced against Mr. Harding the old Council of *Carthage*, now he flieth from the said old council, and runneth to a title only, or abbreviation of the other Council of *Hippo*, not mentioned by him before, and abandoneth altogether his old Council of *Carthage*, which before he cited against the Papists; which manner of dealing did wonderfully much mislike me.

Mr. Jewell flie-
th the authority
of the Council of
Carthage which
himself had al-
leged.

7. But to let this pass, and to return to the view of the other fifteen untruths here pretended to be answered by Mr. Jewell. First: to four or five of them little or nothing is said; to wit, the 11th, 12th, 13th, 15th, and 16th, for that, perhaps, they seemed to him matters of smaller importance; albeit Mr. Harding urgeth, that a falsity may be as well committed in a small matter as in a great, for that the evil mind and purpose of the falsifier is to be respected more than the matter itself. And he addeth, that these small matters were picked out of purpose by Mr. Jewell, among so main a multitude, thereby to fly the greater, which he proveth; for that no one of the greater here touched by Mr. Jewell is, or can be, truly or probably defended in all respects, as we have seen now, in the untruth uttered about the Council of *Carthage*, which was the fourteenth instance or example in order of these sixteen, pretended here to be satisfied by him. Wherefore, now we shall pass to examine some other.

The examina-
tion of fifteen
objected falsi-
ties.

8. The sixth objected untruth, as they lie in Mr. Jewell's view, is about Pope John XXII., and set down in his "Apology" in these words, to wit, *That he held a wicked and detestable opinion of the life to come, and immortality of the soul*;* which accusation Mr. Jewell had out of Mr. Calvin in substance, whose words were, *that Pope John affirmed man's soul to be mortal*.† And as there we shewed Mr. Calvin's report to be false, so here doth Dr. Harding shew the same of Mr. Jewell's assertion, by testimony of many witnesses. Whereunto Mr. Jewell, going about to reply, and excuse himself in defence of the said "Apology," Dr. Harding sheweth that he entangleth himself more and

Whether Pope
John XXII. de-
nied the immor-
tality of the
soul or no.

* Jewell's *Apology*, part 6, c. 5.

† See p. 161.

more, and addeth lie upon lie; for that he, now coming to defend the same in his defence, doth not only affirm the same again, but addeth, moreover, many other untruths, not answerable, as to me it seemed in perusing the testimonies by him alleged. His words of defence do consist in citing some authority for his first accusation, which before he did not, and they are these: *Gerson writeth in sermone paschali* (saith he) *Pope John XXII. to have decreed that the souls of the wicked should not be punished before the day of last judgment,** where you see a new accusation, different both from that himself said before, and Calvin also, of the mortality of the soul. For here he accuseth him for holding that the souls of the wicked should not be punished before the day of judgment; so as, instead of clearing one false accusation against Pope John XXII., he bringeth in another, not heard of before, wherein also he falsifieth his author, Gerson, who hath no such word. But the true controversy was, indeed, *Whether the souls of the just* (not of the wicked) *should see God face to face before the day of judgment or not?†* Wherein Pope John, being reader of divinity in France before he was Pope, inclined to the negative part, as before hath been said; which negative also Mr. Calvin himself defended, as is declared in the same place.

9. Here, then, many things came to my mind of wonder. First: that Mr. Jewell would reiterate and go about to defend this matter, being before so clearly confuted in Mr. Harding's "Confutation,"‡ as is to be seen. Secondly: that he would change the whole question from the souls of the just to the souls of the wicked, and in both dissent from Mr. Calvin, whose words were, in his accusation of Pope John, *asseruit animas esse mortales, unàque cum corporibus interire, usque ad diem resurrectionis §*—"Pope John did affirm souls to be mortal, and that they die, together with their bodies, until the day of resurrection;" which, as it is found to be a false accusation, as appeareth both by the authors before cited, and by the very words themselves of the controversy set down in the "Extravagant" of Pope Benedictus, that determined the question after Pope

* Jewell, p. 617.

† See pages 161, 162.

‡ Confutation, f. 185.

§ Instit., l. 4, c. 7, s. 18.

John was dead; so are they quite different, as you see, from the charge of Mr. Jewell here set down, and besides, do contain a certain fond contradiction in themselves: *for souls to die until the day of resurrection*. And, thirdly, that this was decreed by Pope John appeareth so false an assertion as that Mr. Calvin seemeth to have been ashamed to aver it, as Mr. Jewell doth, the plain contrary thereof being set down expressly in the said "Extravagant;" so as Mr. Jewell outgoeth Mr. Calvin in his accusation.

Mr. Calvin
outgoeth Mr.
Jewell in ca-
lumniation.

10. But that which is worst of all the rest, Mr. Jewell useth one sleight more here, which I was ashamed to consider; for he adjoineth to the former accusation of Pope John XXII., for proof, as it were, and confirmation of his former charge, these words, out of the Council of Constance: *Quinimo Joannes Papa XXII., &c.**—"Yea, Pope John XXII. held and believed obstinately that the soul of man did die with his body, and was extinguished as the souls of brute beasts. And, moreover, he said that a man once dead is not to rise again; no, not at the last day:" which testimonies were a very great and direct proof indeed, if truth were used in alleging the same. But the fraud being such, and so manifest as Mr. Jewell could not possibly but know that he deceived his reader egregiously in this point, it put me in a great confusion what to think of his conscience and manner of proceeding; for that this testimony of the Council of Constance doth not touch Pope John XXII. at all; but another, Antipope John, usurping † the popedom, that ensued a hundred years after; they being words of accusation used by certain men that did accuse him in the Council of Constance, under the name of Baltazar de Cossa, calling himself John XXIII.; where, laying against

A notable abuse
about Pope John
XXII. for XXIII.

* [Mansi's Collection. Tom. xxvii. 699.—It should be borne in mind that this is one of the articles of *accusation*: not a *verdict*.]

† [This is very inaccurate. Cossa was, undoubtedly, unworthy of the popedom; but, to use the words of Natalis Alexander, "*pontificatum aliquando juste et legitime possederat*. xvii. 8. He was acknowledged by the majority of Christendom, and convened the Council of Constance. (See his Bull, Mansi, xxvii. 537.) In the second session, he made a conditional engagement to resign. Ib. 567. In the twelfth he was deposed. Ib. 716. John the twenty-third, therefore, was not a "false Pope," in Walsingham's sense of the term.]

him fifty-three articles concerning his wicked life, before he took upon him the said name of Pope; and afterward they added also, in the second part of their accusation, some points touching heresy, or suspicion thereof; as, namely, these words objected by Mr. Jewell, but proved not the same as they did the other part of ill life, which appeareth, by their own words, that he was *diffamatus apud clerum et populum*—"defamed thereof both with the clergy and people;" which was no marvel, considering his ill manners, that men suspected him also not to believe the life to come; which, notwithstanding, if it had been proved so substantially as his bad manners were, this of heresy must have been the first part of his accusation, and not the second; and the council deposing him would have set down this as first and chief for his deposition; forso-much as heresy is the proper cause, as Dr. Harding sheweth, for which even true popes may be deprived of their dignity, which this man not being, but rather a usurper, as hath been said, and the proofs for the second part failing, as it seemeth, the Council mentioneth only crimes of bad life in the sentence of his deprivation.

*Singular fraud
indeed.*

11. But, howsoever this be, and whether this point of heresy were proved against him or no, the thing that is most to be noted by me is the strange dealing of Mr. Jewell, that did not blush to accuse the true Pope John XXII. of the things that were laid against John, the false Pope, named XXIII.; endeavouring to deceive his reader, making him believe that of the one which was objected to the other. Nor can he excuse himself by the nearness of the names or numbers of XXII. and XXIII., for that they lived a hundred years (as had been said) distant one from the other, the one dying upon the year 1334, the other 1419. This untruth then, objected by Mr. Harding, seemeth not so much excused, answered, or satisfied by Mr. Jewell, as increased and greatly aggravated by adding divers other notorious and evident untruths, not defensible by any means, for aught that I could see, or find out by my best diligence used therein, as now before you have heard.

12. Another voluntary untruth objected to Mr. Jewell is where he saith, in his "Apology," and repeateth the

same in divers places, *that Pope Liberius was a favourer of the Arian heretics* :* which Mr. Harding noting in his "Confutation" for an untruth, Mr. Jewell replieth in his "Defence," that St. Jerome is his witness : whereupon, St. Jerome being examined, I found that he saith only that Pope Liberius subscribed for fear, *victus exilii tædio* † — "overcome with the wearisomeness of his banishment." And again, in another place : *Fortunatianus* (saith he), *Bishop of Aquileia, was the first that did solicit him, as he was going into banishment, for his faith ; and at length overcame him, compelled him to the subscription of heresy.* ‡ Now, saith Dr. Harding, these testimonies do not justify Mr. Jewell's accusation that Pope Liberius was a favourer of the Arians ; for that it is one thing to favour heretics or heresies, and another to subscribe unto them upon fear and compulsion ; for that the one is of infirmity, the other of malice ; the one of compulsion, the other of freewill and choice : and so, to give an example or two (saith he), St. Peter may not truly be said to have favoured the Jews, in their actions against Christ, when he denied him through fear and frailty ; nor would Mr. Jewell take it otherwise but that himself were greatly injured if, for that he subscribed publicly in Queen Mary's days, in St. Mary's Church, in Oxford, to the principal articles of the Roman religion, therefore he should have been held to be a favourer of Papists, and their religion, in those days : so as still it seemeth that this untruth remaineth uncleared on Mr. Jewell's side.

Now Mr. Jewell subscribed publicly to Roman religion in Queen Mary's time.

13. There followeth another, about St. Gregory Nazianzen, of whom Mr. Jewell, in his "Apology," writeth thus : § *Gregory Nazianzen saith, speaking of his own father, that a good and diligent bishop doth serve in the ministry never the worse for that he is married, but rather the*

* Apology, p. 6, c. 5, div. 2.

† Jerome in Chron. ad ann. 352.

‡ Jer. in Catal. Scrip. Eccl. c. 97. [On this subject, the interest of which is chiefly historical, the reader will do well to consult Alban Butler's note regarding Liberius (Saints' Lives, May 2), or Hermant's more ample disquisition, in his *Vie de St. Athanase*, ii, 730. It may be added here, that several eminent writers, as Corgne and F. A. Zaccaria, have plausibly argued that the "fall" of Liberius is a fiction.]

§ Apol. p. 2, cap. 8.

A great falsity
about St. Na-
zianzen's mo-
ther.

better. This Mr. Harding returneth for a lie, saying that it is impossible that Nazianzen should write thus; for that it should be contrary to the sense, not only of all the ancient fathers, and himself in divers other places, but even of Holy Scripture itself; for St. Paul expressly to the Corinthians saith, that he that is without a wife *careth for the things of our Lord, and he that is married for the things of the world,** &c.; and that the authors cited in the margin for this saying of Nazianzen here, to wit, Sozomen,† Eusebius,‡ and Nazianzen himself, are all belied in this behalf, not having any such thing. Whereunto Mr. Jewell now replieth in his "Defence," in these words: "Nazianzen's words be very plain—*Patri meo mater mea, &c.*—'My mother being given to my father of God, became not only his helper, for that had been no great wonder, but also was his leader and captain, both by word and by deed, training him unto the best in religion and godliness, she doubted not to become his mistress.'" But here Mr. Harding accuseth Mr. Jewell of more art and falsehood than before, as suppressing the true meaning of these words, § which himself well knew to be, that Nazianzen's mother, being a good Christian and devout woman, did help greatly to the conversion of his father from infidelity, even as Monica, the mother of St. Augustine, did help much to the conversion of his father Patritius from Gentility, as himself testifieth;|| but that Nazianzen's mother

* 1 Cor. vii.

† Soz. in Hist.—Nazian. in Monod. et Orat. Funeb. Patris.

‡ Euseb. l. 10, Hist. c. 5. [This and the foregoing references are Jewell's. But, says Harding, "This I am sure of, that neither Sozomenus, nor Gregory Nazianzen, nor Eusebius, lib. 10, cap. 5, as you have caused your books, both in Latin and English, to be noted in the margin, where you mistake Eusebius for Rufinus; nor Nazianzen, either in Monodia, as you note also in the margin, nor in the funeral oration that he made of his father, hath any such sayings as you report of them."—Confut. 76. See note* in next page.]

§ Detect. f. 63. [This meaning will be evident upon comparing the passage given above from the 8th section of the Oration, with the sequel, especially the 12th section, where the conversion and baptism of Nazianzen's father are related.—Ed. Bened. i. 335—339. In fact, Jewell was constrained to allow it ("*It is true indeed.*"—Defence, 184); and so resorted to his usual expedient—a scoff at his adversary.]

// *Aug. Confess. lib. ix. c. 9.*

did help his father in the ministry of his bishop's office and function, which here is affirmed by Mr. Jewell (saith Mr. Harding), he never said or thought. And so, by conference, I also found it to be plain and evident, and did admire Mr. Jewell's cunning and fraudulent dealing therein.*

14. The last example that I mean to treat in this place is about the sitting and subscribing of secular men, civil magistrates, as judges in councils and synods about religion, which Mr. Jewell, to prove, in his "Apology" hath these words:†—*In the Council of Chalcedon (saith he) the civil magistrate condemned for heretics, by the sentence of his own mouth, the bishops Dioscorus, Juvenal, and Thallassius, and gave judgment to put them down from that promotion in the church.* Out of which words Dr. Harding, in his "Confutation" of the "Apology,"‡ objecteth two or three manifest untruths, and proveth them to be such out of the council itself: first, that none of these three named heretical bishops were condemned indeed in the Council of Chalcedon by the civil magistrate, but by the council itself, and by sentence pronounced by the legate of Pope Leo I., who sat there as president.§ Secondly, that not only these three, but other three also, are named as worthy condemnation by that "magistrate" which Mr. Jewell meaneth; that is to say, certain senators or noblemen that sat there, with the authority of the Emperor Marcianus, not as judges, but as assistants, for honour and help of the said council, as is expressly there said. Thirdly, that only Dioscorus, and none of the other five, had sentence of condemnation pronounced against him. All which he proveth out of the acts of the council itself,

* [In the quotation which Walsingham has given from Jewell's Apology there is an omission which shall here be supplied. Jewell's words are:—"And as Sozomenus saith of Spiridion, and as Nazianzen saith of his own father," &c.—Of course, it is intimated that the historian says that Spiridion "was rather the better, because he was a married man." But this the historian does not say. His words are: γαμετήν και παῖδας ἔχων, ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο τὰ θεῖα χείρων. (Reading's edition, p. 22.) "He had a wife and children, but was nevertheless none the worse, in regard of God's service." Jewell's justification of himself against Harding is characteristic. "The whole difference that is between Mr. Harding and us, touching this matter, standeth only in these two poor words, rather the better, and never the worse,"]

† Apol. p. 6, c. 14, divis. 2. ‡ Confut. fol. 350. § Concil. Chalced. act. 3.

which was held against Eutyches, and Dioscorus, his favourer, upon the year of Christ 455; there being present thereat six hundred and thirty fathers that gave voices for their condemnation.

15. Let us then see now how Mr. Jewell defendeth himself against this charge. He allegeth,* first, for his justification, the testimony of the council itself, in the first Action, where these words are spoken by the foresaid noble laymen: *Videtur nobis justum esse, &c.*—"It seemeth just to us that the reverend Bishop of Alexandria, Dioscorus; and the reverend Bishop of Jerusalem, Juvenal; and the reverend Bishop of Cesaræa, in Cappadocia, Thalassius, be subject unto the same punishment, and that they be deprived *by the holy council* from their episcopal dignity, *according to the canons.*" Which very last words, saith Dr. Harding, do overthrow all the defence which Mr. Jewell pretendeth to make for avoiding the untruth objected; for that these noblemen, captains, and senators, whose names are set down in the first action of the council (and are very many), being sent thither by the emperor to defend and assist the said council,† and having heard all the disorders passed a little before in favour of Eutyches, in a certain unlawful synod gathered together at Ephesus, gave their opinion to the council, *Videtur nobis justum, &c.*—"It seemeth just unto us," say they, "that, forso much as Flavianus, of holy memory, and the reverend Bishop Eusebius, are found unjustly to have been deposed (by Dioscorus and his fellows, in the synod aforesaid), that the said Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria; Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem; Thalassius, Bishop of Cesaræa; Eusebius, Bishop of Ancyra; Eustachius, Bishop of Berythus; and Basilius, Bishop of Seleucia, should suffer the same punishment (*of deposition*), and be removed from their episcopal dignity by the holy council, according to the canons."

16. "Here, then, we see not three, but six bishops (saith Dr. Harding) esteemed worthy of deposition by the noblemen; but yet, for that five of them did afterward repent, they were pardoned, and received into union again by the said council, as is set down at large in the fourth

* Mr. Jewell, Defence, p. 683.

† Conc. Chalced. p. 226.

Action; where, congratulation being made for their return, it is said: *Ipsi quinque episcopi fidei subscripserunt, sicut Leo sic sapiunt*—"The five bishops themselves (besides Dioscorus) have subscribed, and as Leo, the Pope of Rome, thinketh and holdeth, so they think and hold." Which was admitted for a sufficient argument of their Catholic mind and opinion, that they subscribed to the faith of Pope Leo, though absent. But as for Dioscorus, who persevered in the heresy of Eutyches, he was condemned by the council, and sentence pronounced against him by the two bishops, Paschasinus and Lucentius, and by Bonifacius, a priest, legates for Pope Leo in that council; and the sentence was given in these words, as is extant in the third Action:—"Paschasinus having asked the consent of the fathers present in the council to the condemnation of Dioscorus, after his fault rehearsed, with his two fellows, Lucentius and Bonifacius, said: 'The most holy and blessed Archbishop of the great and elder Rome, Leo, by us, and by this present holy synod, with the thrice most blessed and worthy of all praise Peter the Apostle, who is the rock and highest top of the Catholic Church, and who is the foundation of the right faith, hath deprived Dioscorus, as well of the dignity of his bishopric, as also of his priestly ministry.'"

The sentence
given against
Dioscorus by
Pope Leo's le-
gates.

17. This was the sentence pronounced, not by laymen, as we see, but by priests, as legates of the Bishop of Rome, though this council were held in Greece. And one only is condemned—not three (as Mr. Jewell said); and this according to the rule of the canons, and by consent of the council; which the words of the noblemen themselves, before mentioned, do sufficiently prove (saith Mr. Harding*); for that the proper usual words of giving sentence in such ecclesiastical causes are, *I pronounce, I condemn, I absolve, &c.*, and not *Videtur nobis justum esse, &c.*—"It seemed to us just, &c.," that such a thing be done, as their speech was. And, moreover, he sheweth that, albeit ordinarily, in councils, when such great princes, magistrates, or ambassadors of the laity are present, their subscriptions

* Dr. Harding, Confut. p. 316; Detect. p. 72.

also are required for allowing of the said council, and better execution thereof; yet do they in different manner subscribe from the bishops, to wit, after them, and not among them; and in another manner of subscription, to wit, *Consentiens subscripsi*—"I have subscribed, as giving consent." But the bishops' subscription is, *Definiens subscripsi*—"I have defined and subscribed." So as, by all this, after examination by me made, I found not that Mr. Jewell had any way cleared the former charge laid against him, of untrue alleging this example of the Council of Chalcedon.

18. Wherefore, being now weary, I thought good to pass no further in this matter, assuring the reader that the other untruths objected are no better cleared or satisfied, in my judgment, than these which I have recited. And hereupon I thought with myself, what an endless labour it would be, if a man would or could wade through and examine all these thousand and odd hundreds which are objected out of all his writings; which truly, now the more that I did read with attention, making reflection and some ponderation upon every thing, as in former times I did not, I grew to be so weary thereof, and so full of admiration of my former simplicity and credulity in believing and admitting the same, as I could not tell what to think or say; for it seemed to me now that his manner of writing was nothing else but a pleasing vein of sweet words, phrases, and sentences, couched together very cunningly, or rather craftily infarced everywhere with scoffs, ironies, interrogations, rejections, amplifications, exaggerations against his adversaries; affirming and denying boldly, without scruple, whatsoever seemed to fit his purpose, and alleging examples, testimonies, and authorities, with so many corruptions, additions, diminutions, and other sleight conveyances, to draw them to his designments, as I could now believe nothing with confidence, but fell into suspicion of every thing, until I had examined the same. And commonly the examen discovered more shifts than I could suspect. Whereupon I remember I had this cogitation: In what case many of my condition in England are that do found

for contemplation upon Mr. Jewell's writings.

all their doctrine, sermons, and writings, commonly upon the sermons and writings of Mr. Jewell, as their chief father, prelate, patriarch, and doctor in that behalf; so as, if any man have his two great books of "Reply" and "Defence," they persuade themselves to have a competent library for matters of controversy (and so did I also), especially if they have, in like manner, the Acts and Monuments of Mr. Fox, for matter of ecclesiastical history. And if any do further add unto these Mr. Calvin's "Institutions," he thinketh his furniture very complete, for Protestant doctors. Wherefore, having examined the truth of two of these, to wit, Mr. Calvin and Mr. Jewell, I passed to the third, which was Mr. Fox, whom I found to have so far surpassed in all manner of untrue dealing, as that, in my opinion, he cometh little short of another Protestant historiographer in Germany, called John Sleidan, who, being diversly confuted by sundry learned men of that nation, was accused to have committed an eleven thousand lies in his story;* so that the emperor himself, Charles V., commanding his book once to be read in his own hearing, often interrupted the reader, saying, *There the knave lieth*, and *There the knave lieth*. Wherefore, presuming that Mr. Fox's fidelity is found out by most judicious Protestants themselves,† having sometimes heard a wise gentleman of the same religion affirm he marvelled that the council would permit such a lying book to be sold; and especially for that the whole forest of his falsehoods is so plainly discovered and largely confuted in that excellent treatise of "The Three Conversions of England," written by N. D., I shall request the reader to repair to the said treatise for his full satisfaction herein. And so, from Mr. Fox I proceeded to some others of the more learned sort that ensued after him; whereof I shall give relation somewhat more particularly in the ensuing chapters.

* Defence of the Censure, p. 70.

† [And recently by the learned S. R. Maitland, librarian to the Archbishop of Canterbury.]

CHAPTER X.

How after this I proceeded to examine the Imputations of other Untruths laid against sundry Protestant Writers, to the number of some nine or ten ; and what I found in the perusal thereof, especially in Imputations laid against Mr. Willet.

ALBEIT the experience I had made in the former chapters of untruths uttered by Protestant writers, which I could not excuse from wilful fraud and witting falsity, had so greatly now cloyed my mind, as I had no great desire to pass on in examining of others : yet for that I had purposed and promised the same, I resolved to continue somewhat further in the course now begun. And first, for more facility and brevity's sake, I thought best to examine such untruths as I found objected against our writers by those of the Roman religion, to see whether they were true or no, as they were objected. And of this sort I would wish the reader to peruse the treatise of "Equivocation," lately published by P. R.,* wherein he shall find four or five Protestant writers (all ministers) charged one after the other for evident false dealing ; as, namely, Mr. John Fox, Mr. Dr. Calfehill, Mr. Meredith Hanmer, Mr. William Charke, and Mr. William Perkins ;† whose several untruths are there set down ; as also those of three other laymen and knights accused of the like untrue dealing, to wit, Sir Francis Hastings, Sir Philip Mornay, and Sir Edward Cooke, now Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.

2. All which accusations, when I had examined in the authors themselves, conferring place with place, and mat-

* [Father Robert Persons, of whom Walsingham often speaks.]

† Mitig. cap. 12, sect. 4.

ter with matter, I must confess, that I found the things as they were objected, and hardly could I imagine which way they might be answered. To which effect also I thought with myself, that if it had been easy to answer them, Mr. Morton himself, against whom they were alleged, would not have pretermitted to have said somewhat to some of them in his last "Reply."* But yet, I see, he did not, and this increased much more my suspicion and jealousy in that behalf; especially forso much as, in a late Rejoinder,† made by the said P. R. to the foresaid "Reply," I see Mr. Morton recharged (and indeed much overcharged, if I be not deceived) with an addition of almost one hundred new untruths, to an excessive number objected unto him before in the "Mitigation;" all which I do not see in my poor judgment how he can clear.

3. But I had seen also before this, and perused many things in this kind objected against Mr. Matthew Sutcliffe by sundry of the Roman religion, that had written against him under divers names, as W. R., which he interpreteth to be F. Richard Walpole, that wrote a "Confutation" of his "Challenge." E. O. also, or Mr. Philip Woodward, whom everywhere he calleth Owlglass, gathered sundry untruths out of the same "Challenge" of his; Mr. Dr. Kellison, in like manner, hath written, as I understand, against the same man; but more than any N. D., in sundry books, whom he interpreteth to be F. Persons; all which do charge deeply Mr. Sutcliffe for untrue dealing; and I must needs say, that after some time bestowed in perusal of that which both sides do allege, I remained exceeding ill satisfied of Mr. Sutcliffe's truth in his writing; whereof I shall have occasion to speak more largely in the third part of this my Search, where I mean to bestow divers and several chapters about that argument; for that I must needs confess, that no one author's writings did more settle me in the opinion that Protestants dealt not sincerely in defending their cause than those of Mr. Sutcliffe; and the multitude of examples, that after I am to allege out of him, must excuse my brevity

Mr. Sutcliffe's
bad dealing
much moved
me.

* In his preamble against P. R.

† Entitled A Quiet and Sober Reckoning with Mr. Morton.

and silence in this place. For afterward I fear the reader will rather be cloyed with my prolixity in that affair.

4. Wherefore from this I passed to another examination that had been made some few years ago between one Mr. Willet, a Protestant minister, and his adversary of the Roman religion, whose name he setteth not down; Mr. A. Willet, and falsities objected against him. which adversary of his had charged him both with slanders, contradictions, falsifications, and corruptions, in two books published by the said Willet, entitled "Synopsis Papismi" and "Tetrastylon Papisticum;" which very titles, though they seemed to me to savour of some extravagant humour (he writing in English), yet I thought with myself I would behold a little this combat, and consider how he defendeth himself, which I found indeed, as I had done in others before, only impertinent shifts, and no substantial satisfaction; whereof I mean to give some few examples only of many that might be alleged.

5. Page 29, his adversary doth object against him these words of his, taken out of his "Synopsis," page 609:

The first false charge about the mass. *The mass promiseth sufficient redemption to the wicked that have spent their life in drunkenness, adultery, &c., if they come to the church and hear mass, and take holy bread and holy water, &c., though they never pray, nor repent, nor hear the word preached.* Which words, being confessed by Mr. Willet to be his, his adversary doth infer upon him wilful lying, or intolerable ignorance in setting down this charge; for that in no writer of theirs in the world shall he find this proposition or the parts thereof set down, to wit, *that drunkenness, adultery, and other such mortal sins, may be forgiven by hearing of mass, taking holy bread or holy water, and much less without repentance*, wherein only standeth the means to remit such sins, according to their doctrine. The which when I had considered, and looked upon divers books of theirs that do clearly testify the same, I did wonder how he would defend himself in this charge; for he setteth down a defence after every one of the said charges made against him. Here then I expected what he would say for proof or defence of this his assertion;

but I found right nothing at all to the purpose itself. For that, after a jest or scoff (for this is his manner of answering) set down out of Plato, who bidding Xenocrates, a sour and austere fellow, to sacrifice to the Graces, he taketh occasion for more than a dozen pages together to prove that the Roman doctrine doth not favour virtue of good manners more than the Protestant, nor yet so much; alleging for his proof, that *to hold the commandments to be impossible*, and that *the first motions of concupiscence be sin without consent*, and that *a man is sure of his predestination by faith*, and the like doctrines, which Protestants do hold, are causes of much virtue among them, as the contrary doctrine held by Papists are causes of wicked life on their part.

6. But all this I saw to be wholly from the purpose, and now see to be most false; neither did I find in his whole discourse any one thing tending to prove the chief and only point in controversy, whether the Roman doctrine doth teach, that by *hearing a mass, taking holy bread or holy water*, without prayer or repentance, *drunkenness, adultery*, and other like sins, might be redeemed. So as here Mr. Willet setting down with his own pen the charge made against himself, and professing to make a clear defence thereof, and yet to make no word of mention therein of the chief and principal point, seemed to me a strange kind of defence; but yet besides this I did note, that in prosecuting his accusations against the said Roman religion for loose and wicked life both in Popes and prelates and other men, which he ascribed to the corruption of their doctrine, he touched divers particulars very ridiculous: as this for one.

7. *Your doctrine* (saith he), *in prohibiting and restraining marriage to your clergy, how it helpeth to holiness of life Bernard well sheweth, saying: Tolle de ecclesia honorabile conjugium et thorum immaculatum, nonne repleas eam concubinariis, incestuosis, &c.?*—"Take out of the church honourable marriage, and the bed undefiled, shall you not fill the same with fornicators, incestuous persons, and the like?"*

The second false charge about marriage of priests.

* Bernardi Sermo 66 in Cant. [iv. 3067.]

St. Bernard ridiculous-ly al-
leged.

Where, truly, I could not but laugh; for that St. Bernard, speaking in defence of marriage, against certain heretics of his time, in France, that impugned the same, saith, that if marriage should be wholly taken away from the Church of God, there would follow these inconveniences; not for that he meant that every man of the church or in the church should be married, for that then himself should have been but in a bad case that never was married; nor for that these filthy vices which are here mentioned did follow upon all them that lived unmarried, for that then he had been bound in conscience to have made all his monks to have married, and himself also; which Mr. Willet could not but see, or else his understanding must be presumed to be very gross. And, if he did see it, and yet would set it down in print to deceive the reader, it must needs be wilful and malicious fraud.

The third charge
about opus ope-
ratum.

8. Another like charge to this followeth presently in the next page in these words: *They hold* (saith Mr. Willet) *that the sacraments do give grace, ex opere operato, "by the work wrought:" and that the faith of the receiver giveth no efficacy to the sacrament.* For which he citeth Bellarmine, lib. 2 *De Sacram.* cap. 1. But when I went to Bellarmine to behold the matter, I could not but be heartily angry with Mr. Willet for such perverse dealing with him. For Bellarmine doth declare most clearly what is meant by this, that sacraments do work their effects, or grace, *ex opere operato*; that is to say—"by the force of the external action appointed and instituted by Christ, not depending of the worthiness or merit, either of the giver or receiver."* As, for example, in baptism, though he that

* [Et hæc (actio externa) vocatur *opus operatum*, accipiendo passive "*operatum*," ita ut idem sit sacramentum conferre gratiam ex opere operato quam conferre gratiam ex vi ipsius actionis sacramentalis a Deo ad hoc institutæ, non ex *merito* agentis vel suscipientis.—If Protestant divines would attend to this plain statement of Bellarmine's—which in fact is but the expression of what is unanimously taught on the subject—we might hope to read no more in their class books such absurd and calumnious imputations as the following: "Papists maintain that the partaking of the Lord's supper necessarily promotes our salvation; and that the *opus operatum*, as they call it, is always attended with real benefit...Papists contend that the mere receiving of the Lord's supper procures remission of sins *ex opere operato*, as it were mechanically, whatever may be the character and disposition of the communicant."—Bp. Tomline's *Elements*, ii. 440, 495.]

administereth the sacrament should be a wicked man, yet that doth not frustrate the effect of the said sacrament: and, on the other side, though sometimes the receiver should want the dispositions of faith, repentance, and the like—as in infants—yet doth not that let* the remission of their sins; though all those that be of years and discretion must have the said dispositions of faith and repentance, without which they cannot obtain the said grace of remission of sins. Insomuch as Bellarmine's express words are: *Falsò et mera calumnia et mendacium est, &c.*—"It is a false and mere calumniation, and a very lie that we do exclude the necessity of faith and penance to obtain the effect and efficacy of the sacraments, for that the Council of Trent itself, in the sixth chapter of the sixth session, doth expressly teach that the beginning of our justification is from faith and penance, and all our divines do hold the same, as we have shewed before, in refuting the lies of our adversaries." So he. So as I found Bellarmine ^{Bellarmino} not only not to have the sentence or sense ^{much abused.} here set down by Mr. Willet, but the very quite contrary; that no man which is of years of discretion can obtain the effect or efficacy of the sacraments, which is grace and remission of sin, without faith and repentance. And so much for this first charge made upon Mr. Willet by his adversary, wherein we see three to be contained, and each of them to be decided and satisfied by him alike, that is, nothing at all. Whereof I could allege many and sundry examples, but it would be over long. I shall therefore pass to the falsifications objected against him, and see what justification he maketh thereof.

9. The first is, page 142 of his "Defence," where he is charged to have used these words, ^{The fourth charge about Antichrist's chair.} in his "Synopsis," page 219: *Bernard saith, that the beast of the Apocalypse, to which a mouth was given speaking blasphemies, doth sit in Peter's chair.* So Mr. Willet. But his adversary, accusing him here of a notable deceit, sheweth that St. Bernard speaketh not at all of the true Pope, but of an Antipope called Petrus Leonis, that, by violence, had made himself an Antichrist. I was

* [i. e. hinder.]

very desirous to see how Mr. Willet would answer it, and so much the more, for that I had seen in the foresaid book of "Mitigation"* the same notorious fraud † objected to Mr. Perkins; seeking to deceive his reader with the words of St. Bernard, as though he had said that the true Pope, sitting in St. Peter's chair, was Antichrist, or the beast in the Apocalypse; but I found that both of them used the same fraud to abuse their reader. Nor doth Mr. Willet allege any thing in his own justification that may probably justify him, though he write a whole paragraph to that purpose, but entangleth himself more in his pretended justification than he did before in the objected falsification. *The question is (saith he), whether Peter's chair should be the seat of Antichrist or no? which, whether these words (now cited out of St. Bernard) do shew or not, any poor grammarian that can but translate a sentence of Latin can easily judge.* So he.

10. And is not this a goodly justification? But hear another as wise as this. He allegeth St. Bernard for saying, in his "Sermon upon Canticles," of certain loose prelates, *ministri sunt Christi, et serviunt Antichristo* ‡—"They are ministers of Christ (by profession), but do serve Antichrist, or Christ's enemy, (by their naughty lives and behaviour)." Out of which

The fifth charge
about serving
of Antichrist.

* Mitig. p. 526.

† [Which "notorious fraud" Bishop Hurd revived. And as, even lately, the imposture has been shamelessly repeated, it shall be fully exposed here:—St. Bernard is denouncing the Antipope, Peter Leonis (see Alban Butler, August 20), and calling on Hildebrand, Archbishop of Tours, and Geoffrey, subsequently Archbishop of Bordeaux, to recognize the canonically-elected Pope Innocent II. Let the reader observe how he speaks of the two parties. Ecce namque *Christus Domini iste Innocentius* positus est in ruinam et in resurrectionem multorum. Nam qui Dei sunt libenter junguntur ei: qui autem *ex adverso stat*, aut Antichristi est, aut Antichristus. Cernitur abominatio stare in loco sancto, quem ut obtineret, incendit ignis sanctuarium Dei. Persequitur Innocentium et cum eo omnem innocentiam. Fugit ille nimirum a facie leonis, &c.—Ep. cxxiv. And in the next epistle: Tempus faciendi nunc, quia dissipaverunt legem. Bestia illa de Apocalypsi, cui datum est os loquens blasphemias et bellum gerere cum sanctis, Petri cathedram occupat, tanquam *leo* paratus ad prædam. The allusion to the Antipope is evident. St. Bernard proceeds to enumerate the several kings that, with clergy and people,—favent et adherent *domino Innocentio tanquam filii patri, tanquam capiti membra, solliciti servare unitatem spiritus in vinculo pacis.*—New Paris ed. i. 322 et seq.]

‡ Bernardi Serm. 33, in Cant. prope fin. [iv. 2883.]

sentence Mr. Willet doth reason sadly, thus : That, forso-much as these prelates were subject to the Pope, and served Antichrist, therefore St. Bernard did hold the Pope for Antichrist. Have you heard such reasoning ? Surely I was ashamed thereof ; for it is the same as if a man should say, a chaplain of my Lord of Canterbury professing himself to be a minister of Christ, yet by wicked life serveth Antichrist ; *ergo*, my Lord of Canterbury is Antichrist, for that this man is subject to him also.

11. A third argument he maketh likewise for his justification, saying, that Bernard, in a certain epistle of his,* doth report of one Norbertus, a good man, that he was of opinion that Antichrist should be revealed in that very age wherein he and Bernard did live. And albeit St. Bernard saith : *Non me illud pro certo credere debere putavi*—"I did not think that I ought to believe it for certain ;" yet Mr. Willet maketh this inference upon it, ^{a ridiculous inference.} and upon the other two sentences of St. Bernard : *We have then* (saith he), *by Bernard's words, both the time of Antichrist's coming, the persons among the clergy, and the place described—the chair of Peter. I report me now to any indifferent judge whether Bernard, either in word or sense, be misreported.* So he. Who thinketh, as you see, to have proved by St. Bernard, that the Pope is Antichrist, and that his coming was in his own days ; and that the chair of Peter was the chair of Antichrist, and the whore of Babylon. And will any man think this probable ? Surely I see the proofs so weak and childish, as it cannot serve but for laughter to have repeated them.

12. Furthermore, page 147, Mr. Willet is accused to have written, in disgrace of the vow of voluntary poverty, in his "Synopsis," page 297 : *That it was the heresy of the Pelagians and Manichees to persuade men to cast away their riches.* Which his adversary turneth upon him for a witting lie, telling him that the said Pelagians and Manichees were not condemned of heresy for persuading men to give away their riches, but for that they maintained that all rich men

The sixth charge about voluntary poverty.

* Bernardi Ep. 56, ad Gaufridum. [i. 202.]

were bound to forsake all their riches, and that otherwise they could not go to heaven. And this his assertion that the heresy of the said heretics consisted in this latter point, and not in the former, he proveth out of St. Augustine at large, both Epistle 106,* and lib. 5 *Contra Faustum*, cap. 10,† and Mr. Willet confesseth the same to be true, but in his justification goeth about to defend himself in these words: *Doth he not, I pray you, that saith, "None but they which cast away their riches shall enter into heaven," consequently persuade men to cast them away? If a man should hear one of the seminary priests avouch that none can be saved unless he be a member of the Roman Church, doth he not, in effect, persuade him to be reconciled unto it? This, then, was their heresy, because it was an effect and consequent of their heresy.‡* So he.

13. Which defence truly, when I had considered, I could not but take pity on Mr. Willet, that was driven to such poor shifts for some shadow of defence, for this is somewhat less than a shadow. For neither doth this effect here named, or consequent, follow, as The confutation of Mr. Willet's shift. Mr. Willet would have it, that, because the Manichees and Pelagians did teach that no man could be saved with his riches, therefore they did persuade them to cast them away; for a man might have said, that he would give them in alms, and so they were not cast away, but laid up in heaven, as they pretend to do that make vow of voluntary poverty. So as this misalleging and misunderstanding of the Pelagians and Manichean heresy in this behalf, thereby to disgrace the vow of voluntary poverty, seemeth not defensible from a voluntary fraud.

14. In the 154th page of his "Defence" two corruptions of a Council of Cologne are objected to Mr. Willet;§ the first, where he translateth this sentence of the council, *ad audiendum sacrum et communicandum*, that the people is to be called together to hear and receive sacraments, whereas his adversary saith, he should have translated it,

* [Ad Hilar. The 157th of the Ben. Ed. 1797.]

† [Tom. x. 242 et seq. Ed. 1797.—In this, as well as in the above-cited passage, St. Augustine clearly explains the distinction between *precept* and *counsel*.]

‡ Ibidem.

§ Conc. Colon. par 9, c. 6, anno 1536.

to hear mass and communicate: for that the word *sacrum* signifieth not *sacraments*, neither is there any sacrament received by hearing, that I know; neither could Mr. Willet be so ignorant or gross in understanding, as not to know that among Catholics and Catholic writers, *sacrum* doth signify *sacrifice* or *mass*. But it made me laugh to see how Mr. Willet endeavoureth to defend himself. For these are the words of his justification: *Here is no one word* (saith he) *of the mass, but only sacrum, which is the neuter gender; but missa, in the Latin, is the feminine gender, and cannot be the substantive to it: Now judge, good reader* (saith he), *which of us doth translate more truly, either he, in construing sacrum, mass; or we, in Englishing it, sacrament?* So he: and methought it was substantially answered, and like a good grammarian; and hereof let the reader judge.

The seventh charge about the word *sacrum* in Catholic writers.

15. The other falsification also objected out of the same council is, where Mr. Willet, page 623 of his "Synopsis," talking of the word penance, saith *that this Council of Cologne doth thereby understand rather the change of the mind and inward contrition and sorrow, than any outward satisfactory work.** But his adversary coming sharply upon him, and shewing at large out of the council itself, that the said council numbereth three parts of penance—*contrition, confession, and satisfaction*—Mr. Willet, confessing the same, seemed to me to be in an inextricable labyrinth; the sum of his defence standing only in these words: *In this place* (saith he) *no mention is made of satisfaction, and yet is this inward sorrow and contrition called penance.* Whereto his adversary will reply, that so is satisfaction also called *penance*, and *confession*, as several parts of the same. And albeit the council in that place, and these very lines, did speak only of the first part, which is contrition; yet presently after they adjoin the other two parts, as appeareth in the council. And what justification, then, is this from falsifying the meaning of the council, that by penance they did understand only inward sorrow?

The eighth charge about contrition.

16. There followeth another falsification objected out of

* Concil. Colon. par. 7, c. 303 et seq.

St. Augustine, whom Mr. Willet, page 957 of his "Synopsis," affirmeth to have taught, *that no such strict necessity of fasting was used in his time as now among the Papists*; which his adversary saith was a witting untruth. For that, among other points, he could not but know that St. Augustine,* among the heresies of Aërius, accounted

The charge about fasting. one to be this, *That he held the prescript fasts of the church not to be observed, and that it was a sin not to keep the fasts of the Lent.* And here now I looked attentively what Mr. Willet would say for his defence in this, but I found it to be very simple in my opinion. For first, concerning Aërius, he saith, that he was not accounted an heretic by St. Augustine for that he held against the set fast of the church, but for that he was an Arian heretic. But St. Augustine saith both; and so doth Epiphanius,† out of whom St. Augustine took it; namely, that falling into the Arian heresy, he added moreover certain doctrines of his own; as, *that men should not pray nor sacrifice for the dead, nor yet observe the prescript fasts of the church*; but rather that each man should fast when he would, *lest he should seem to be under the law.* Both which doctrines the said two fathers do condemn as heretical and rejected by the church in their days. So as in this Mr. Willet seemed to me to be wholly overborne, and not to be able to defend himself at all.

17. But for the *Lent fast*, which St. Augustine saith was a sin to break, Mr. Willet answereth thus:‡ *We also grant that he which of a greedy appetite and gluttonous mind shall break the set fasts of the church (or Lent), instituted for that exercise of prayer and learning the word, doth sin.* Thus saith Mr. Willet, and he thinketh he hath

The fast of the Lent in St. Augustine's time.

Ridiculous differences devised.

satisfied the matter very well. He adjoineth also certain differences between the fasts of St. Augustine's time and ours now. First, because the Lord's days, to wit, Sundays, saith he, where exempted from fasting in old time; secondly, for that men for infirmity, when they could not fast, were dispensed withal; thirdly, for that St. Augustine saith, that where a man could not fast, alms

* August. Sermo 64 de tem. et hæres. 53.

† Epiph. l. 3; Hæres. 75.

‡ Page 159.

might suffice without fasting, &c. *All which things* (saith he) *are not now in the Papists' fasts.* To whom, notwithstanding, this his assertion seemeth most ridiculous, for that the same points are now also in use in their church, as every man knoweth.

18. Page 163, there is objected to Mr. Willet another falsification of St. Augustine, for that page 97 of his "Tetrastylon" he allegeth certain words of St. Augustine that may seem to sound somewhat against prayer for the dead, for that he writeth: *That the pomp of funeral rites and solemnities of burial are comforts of the living, no helps of the dead.* But in the very next ensuing words, St. Augustine having said,* *Impleant hæc homines ergo suos*—let men perform these things to their friends as comforts, &c.; he addeth presently: *But let them perform much more abundantly, instantly, and earnestly those things that do help the spirits of the dead indeed, which are oblations, prayers, and alms-deeds for them.* Which words Mr. Willet did cut quite off; as also in like manner with the said fraud, the words that went before: *Non omnino ambigendum est ista prodesse defunctis*—"We must not doubt at all but that these things do profit the dead:" which being so, Mr. Willet is charged with witting and wilful fraud in this behalf. Whereunto he answereth now in this his justification: first, that he granteth that Augustine seemeth sometimes to be infected with the error of praying for the dead; "yet sometimes, [but when or where you know not,] his speech soundeth to the contrary; secondly, that the opinion of Aërius, condemned by St. Augustine and St. Epiphanius, as hath been said, against prayer for the dead, was no heresy, but an opinion; thirdly, that in the pure time of the primitive church, prayer for the dead was not generally believed; for that Bellarmine doth cite no ancients canon of any council for the same than the third of Carthage, which was about four hundred and twenty years after Christ; *but so long*

The tenth charge about prayer for the dead.

Mr. Willet's triple evasion.

* August. Serm. de Verb. Apost. 32, c. 34. [Sermo clxxii. in the Benedictines' Edition. See their note on the discourse. Tom. v. 576. Ed. 1700.]

we hold not (saith he) the pure time of the primitive church to have continued, which extended not much beyond the age of the apostles."

The confutation.

19. Which answer much misliked me, for that it is five hundred years short of the prescription of Mr. Jewell, in his "Challenge," which admitted the first six hundred years for pure times; and Mr. Fox doth everywhere hold the same, in his "Acts and Monuments," affirming the Christian Britons until the coming of St. Augustine, the monk (which was six hundred years after Christ), to have had the pure gospel and true Catholic church amongst them. Wherefore this audacious shift of Mr. Willet, to condemn St. Augustine of infection with the error, as he calleth it, of praying for the dead, and all the Christian church of his time, and calling into question all the former ages also, even unto the apostles' time, seemed very absurd and intolerable pride.

20. I am forced, for brevity's sake, to pretermitt many such examples as these be, set down by Mr. Willet himself, who, dividing his book of "Answer and Satisfaction" into four several parts, setteth down in the first part thereof thirteen untruths, objected by his adversary as notoriously wilful; and then, in the second, as many objected contradictions; and, in the third, the like number of falsifications of authors; and, in the fourth and last, thirteen corruptions of Scripture. So as all goeth by thirteens, which maketh up fifty-two imputations of lies against himself, equal to the number of weeks in the year, as you see; and they are put off by Mr. Willet so faintly, as now in part you have beheld; yet one or two will I touch more.

The parts of Mr. Willet's defence.

The eleventh charge of corruption.

21. He imputeth, in his book of "Tetraptylon," page 113, to the translators of the Rhemish Testament, this absurdity, *that they hold, that the Gentiles did believe in Christ by their own free-will*; but citeth not the place where we shall read it; which I find to be a trick ordinary when fraud is sought to be covered; but, at length, we find the words to be contained in a certain marginal annotation in the Rhe-

mish Testament, upon the words of St. Paul and St. Barnabas to the Jews, in the Acts of the Apostles : * *To you it behoveth us first to speak the word of God, but because you repel it, &c.* ; where, in the margin, the annotation saith thus : *The Jews, of their own free-will repelling the truth, are unworthy of Christ, and worthily forsaken ; and the Gentiles, though they believed especially by God's grace and pre-ordination, yet they believed also by their own free-will, which standeth well with God's providence.* Out of all which sentence Mr. Willet is convinced to have chosen out only the foresaid piece, concealing the rest to make the Rhemists odious, as though they said, *the Gentiles believed by their own free-will without grace.* And how can this be excused, say they, from malicious and untrute dealing ? Mr. Willet's justification in this place † seemeth to be very miserable and ridiculous, forsomuch as, in effect, he confesseth the fact and cannot deny it, to wit, of leaving out the one part and setting down the other, though he seek to gloss the matter somewhat about his meaning therein, but little to the purpose of any just defence.

22. There followeth another, and this shall be the last which we mean to handle in this place, but it is notable, and worthy more the laughter perhaps than any of the rest, if not rather disdain, for the folly and malice thereof; and the point is, that in his book of "Tetrastylon," page 142, talking of the Donatists that pretended from Carthage (where they first begun) to have set forth into the world the true light of the Gospel, he bringeth in Bellarmine writing thus of St. Augustine : *Augustinus absurdissimum censuit, quod heresis Donatistarum, &c.*—"Augustine did think it a most absurd thing, that the heresy of the Donatists (three hundred years after Christ) should out of Carthage be propagated into all the earth." Which words of Bellarmine, without naming any place where we should find them, Mr. Willet translateth thus : *Augustine did think most absurdly, that the heresy of the Donatists, three hundred years after Christ, should be propagated out of Carthage, &c.*

The twelfth
charge about
construing
absurdissimum.

* Acts xiii. 45.

† Defence, p. 204.

Whereas, you see, he maketh Bellarmine to accuse St. Augustine first of absurdity, and then taxeth Bellarmine himself of lack of skill in Latin, in that he setteth down an adjective for an adverb, *absurdissimum* for *absurdissime*: which truly seemed to me to be such a charge, as I expected that Mr. Willet would excuse it by some error of print; but I found him* to stand unto the defence thereof, holding that those words, *Augustinus absurdissimum censuit*, were truly and properly to be translated, "Augustine did most absurdly think," &c. And for proof that Bellarmine is somewhat bold sometimes, as he saith, with St. Augustine, he produceth another place of Bellarmine, lib. i. *De Verbo Dei*, cap. 5, where he affirmed that St. Augustine, upon the 126th Psalm, and elsewhere, doth oftentimes write that Solomon was reprobate of God—*Salomonem à Deo reprobatum fuisse*; but (saith Mr. Willet), in that place cited by Bellarmine there is no such thing affirmed by Augustine. Which, if it were true, yet doth not Bellarmine by this lay any lie upon St. Augustine, but should rather err himself in misreporting St. Augustine.

23. But surely the behaviour of Mr. Willet is such in this as I was ashamed to have examined the case; for thus he writeth:† *I find not so much as Solomon's name to be mentioned by St. Augustine in the exposition of the psalm; but in the "Enarration" thereof he only saith: Quid mirum, si in populo Dei cecidit Salomon? In paradiso non cecidit Adam? &c.*—"What marvel if Solomon fell among the people of God? Did not Adam fall in paradise?" Where St. Augustine speaketh of the fall of Solomon, not of his reprobation; for if Solomon fell no otherwise than Adam, he is no reprobate. So Mr. Willet, to shew that Bellarmine misallegeth St. Augustine; but what if Bellarmine had missed in his citation of the number of the psalm, or that the thing by him affirmed were not to be found in the very place of St. Augustine by him cited, but in some others; were this sufficient to note Bellarmine, that he is bold with St. Augustine to ascribe absurd speeches unto him, as here Mr. Willet would defend? Nay more, what if St. Augustine

A perspicuous
confutation of
Mr. Willet's
wilful falsity.

* Page 199.

† Defence, p. 200.

have these very words by Bellarmine affirmed, and that in the very same place by him cited in St. Augustine's "Enarration upon the 126th Psalm?" and that this could not but be known to Mr. Willet, and were of purpose left out of him to make a quarrel against Bellarmine? What shall we think then of this man? Let the reader then go to St. Augustine,* and see his "Enarration" upon the foresaid psalm, and read the words by Mr. Willet himself now cited: *Quid mirum si in populo Dei cecidit Salomon?* and just eight lines before that are these words of St. Augustine: *Nam ipse Salomon mulierum amator fuit, et reprobatus est à Deo*—"For Solomon himself was a lover of women, and reprobate of God." And what shall we say of Mr. Willet now? Had it not been better for him to have confessed his error, than thus absurdly to go about to defend it? But you shall hear yet another defence, which he calleth grammatical, the most solemn foolery, if I be not deceived, that ever grammarian or other, professing learning, took upon him: it is set down thus in his own words.

A solemn foolery in Mr. Willet's grammatical defence.

24. *The grammatical construction (saith he) of this sentence of Bellarmine (Augustinus absurdissimum censuit, quod hæresis Donatistarum, &c.) may seem rather to yield this sense (of mine) that Augustine thought most absurdly, than that he thought it an absurd thing: for in this latter translation two things must be understood: both the verb esse (to be) and hoc, or id (this), so that to make a full sense the words must be supplied thus: Augustinus absurdissimum hoc esse censuit—"Augustine thought this a most absurd thing, that," &c. But in the other construction (which is mine) there is a full sense in the words expressed without any supply. Now, any simple grammarian knoweth this, that the words expressed do rather make the sense, if they be perfect, than words supplied or understood; and, if ever the libeller (my adversary) taught grammar boys, he might have remembered that they are not in construction to say supple or*

A solemn foolery in Mr. Willet's grammatical defence.

* August. in Psalm cxxvi. n. 2. [Tom. vii. 825. Ed. 1797.]

subaudi, to supply such or such a word, where the sentence of itself maketh a full sense.

25. Thus far discourseth Mr. Willet out of grammar; but why had he not shewed that the words *absurdissimum* and *absurdissime* do signify all one thing? Will any schoolmaster defend that for him? Or that any *supple* or *subaudi* is necessary for interpreting *Augustinus absurdissimum censuit*—"Augustine did think it a most absurd thing?" Or is it not most absurd and ridiculous to stand upon the supplying of *hoc, id, and esse* (as Mr. Willet doth) where no such supplement is needful at all to him that hath any knowledge or understanding in the Latin tongue? Are not the Protestants well holpen up to have such defenders of their cause, to publish such books in print, as Mr. Willet is, who seemeth to be only some poor grammarian schoolmaster indeed; for that in the end of every one of his defences or justifications he hath for the conclusion and upshot thereof some sentence or two gathered out of Greek authors, with the Greek text set down in the margin for ostentation: which sentences being reduced to common-places do serve him for one purpose or other at every turn; and with this he thinketh to have supplied and satisfied for all the defects committed in the defence itself. So as the reader for divinity must take grammar sentences of poetry and humanity. And this is the substance I found in that book.

26. And having dwelt longer upon the examination of the particulars than I had thought or purposed in the beginning, having meant to discuss but an instance or two, I shall pass no further in view of these kind of untruths, as have been noted and objected by others, but rather shall lay forth some of mine own observation in reading dispersedly Protestant books, here and there as they came to my hands. For that having no small experience by that which before we have examined, and learned thereby to doubt of fraud and uneven dealing in such books as I took into my hands, I found such store of matter as would serve for volumes, if I should prosecute the whole. But some I shall touch in the ensuing chapters.

CHAPTER XI.

How next after this I lighted upon a book of Mr. Doctor Dove, wherein he persuadeth English Recusants to leave their recusancy, and to join with him and the English Church in points of Protestant Religion; the reasons which he useth, and the small substance and bad manner of dealing that I found therein.

HAVING made, then, this determination, and casting my eyes upon divers Protestant books, I chanced to lay my hands upon a treatise of Mr. Doctor Dove, published in the year one thousand six hundred and four, with this title: *A Persuasion to the English Recusants to reconcile themselves to the Church of England: and written* (as he saith) *for the better satisfaction of those which be ignorant; the work being dedicated to the King's Majesty himself.*

2. In this work, after he hath shewed in his first chapter, that whereas it was wont to be reputed a punishment in old time to be interdicted, suspended, and shut out of the church or congregation, Papists now did shut out themselves, *in such sort* (saith he) *as we have as much need now to whip them into the temple as our Saviour had to whip them out.* After this, I say, he entereth to consider the causes of this recusancy, confessing that the Catholics do allege for the same the repugnance of their conscience; and then addeth, further: *I confess* (quoth he) *that whatsoever is done without testimony and warrant of conscience is sin to them which do it, be the thing in itself never so lawful;** because the apostle saith: *He that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin.†* So Mr. Dove. Wherein he seemed to me substantially to justify, out of these

* Persuasion, cap. 2.

† Rom. xiv.

words of St. Paul, the recusancy of Catholics, if they can prove that they have a good ground or motive of their conscience. And, further, it followeth that if they could not, and that their conscience were erroneous, and founded upon false principles, yet so long as that persuasion endureth, it seemeth that they may not be enforced to do the contrary act, which is sin unto them, and to such as do enforce them, even as no man, without sin, could enforce the eater, whereof St. Paul speaketh, to eat against his conscience without sin to them both.

3. But, secondly, about the motive which Papists pretend to have for inducing, or, rather, obliging them to avoid the participation with Protestants in church prayer and other divine matters, Mr. Dove saith, that it is for that they hold Protestant religion for schism and heresy. *Which opinion, if it were true (saith he), then should they have great reason to refuse the said participation with them; for that it is undoubtedly true, and grounded upon Scripture (Tit. iii., Rom. xvi., 2 John i.), that no heretics or schismatics are to be communicated withal.* So as all the

The state of the question. controversy is reduced now by him to this point, whether Protestant religion be to the Papists schism or heresy, or to be touched therewith, and consequently whether the said Papists' conscience be well or no, in flying this participation of Protestants' service; which was a point that I had desired much of long time to see well handled, and so did read greedily this Treatise of Mr. Dove for a time, hoping to find something of moment therein; but in the end all turned into smoke and mist of words, as to me seemed, without any foundation at all.

4. For, albeit he taketh upon him first, to define *what is conscience*, and then, *what is heresy*, yet in both definitions I found that they did not agree with their *definitum*, or "the thing defined." *I will define unto them (saith Mr. Doctor) what conscience is. Conscience, I say, is an application of a general knowledge grounded upon God's word, to particular actions and intents.** So he, as it seemeth, *ex cathedra*. But this definition I did see presently that it could not agree

A faulty definition of conscience.

* Persuasion, p. 4.

to the conscience of a heathen or Gentile who knoweth not God's word, and yet hath a conscience founded upon the law of nature, as St. Paul testifieth, Rom. ii., saying: *That such men having not the law* (to wit, written) *are a law unto themselves, and do shew forth the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing them witness.* So as the *definitum*, or "thing defined" here (to wit, *conscience*) by Mr. Doctor appeared to me to extend itself further than this his definition, which the logicians do hold for a great absurdity.

5. And the very like I noted in his second definition of *heresy*, which he setteth down in these definitive words: *I define an heresy* (quoth he) *in this manner: It is an error stiffly and obstinately defended and maintained, not by a consequent, but directly impugning some article of faith.** Which definition reacheth nothing so far as the *definitum*, which is *heresy*. For if we look over all the heresies that have been condemned by the Catholic Church, and are recorded by ancient writers, as Irenæus, Tertullian, Epiphanius, St. Augustine, Theodoret, and others, we shall not find the least part of them to have been directly and expressly against any article of faith† expressed in the Apostles' Creed, or to have been condemned as contrary to God's word by any general council before that their heresy began, but indirectly rather, and by some consequent. As, for example, the Pelagian heretics, that held a man might do good works by the power of his own free-will without grace, what article of faith did it impugn directly? As, likewise, the Aetians, that said that their faith was sufficient, without works, to life everlasting; and that Christ had revealed more to them than to the apostles. The Aerians, in like manner, that were condemned for denying prayer and sacrifice for the dead, and set fasts of the church, what article of the creed do they directly deny? Nay, he that shall read the catalogue of heresies set down by the

A defectuous
definition of
heresy.

* Persuasion, p. 23.

† [FIRST EDITION: against any article of the Apostles' Creed; which is that creed which Mr. Doctor himself a little after doth say that he meaneth; but indirectly...]

holy fathers before mentioned, shall find very few, in effect, to have impugned *directly** any article of faith (especially after the first two ages), but rather *by a consequent*. And, consequently, Mr. Doctor seemeth much overshot in putting in this clause (*not by a consequent*) into his definition of heresy, which clause quite overthroweth the whole. Nor can he prove that his own example of the Arian heresy, by him alleged, did directly, or in express words, impugn any article of the Apostles' Creed; but by a consequent only, to wit, that forso much as they denied the equality of the Son with his Father, they did consequently deny his Godhead: for that in Godhead there can be no inequality; and then, by another consequent, this denial of Christ's divinity impugned the second article of the creed: *I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord*: and, I say, by a *consequent*, for that it impugneth, in effect, the true meaning of the article, that Christ is God, though expressly it doth not say so. Whereby is seen that two several consequents are necessary to make the Arian heresy to impugn this article of the Apostles' Creed: whereof is inferred again, that the Arian heresy is no heresy by Mr. Doctor's definition, and much less the Pelagians, Aetians, Aerians, and a hundred else beside.

6. So as now to come to the upshot of the controversy, though he have defined amiss, as you see, both *conscience* and *heresy*; yet, notwithstanding, he granteth that if the Catholics, upon a good ground of conscience, do persuade themselves that Protestant religion is heresy, that is to say, an error stiffly and obstinately defended, directly, as he saith (or indirectly, and by a consequent, as I hold), against any article of the Apostles' Creed, then they have good reason in their standing out, and that they are so bound to do.

7. But now that they have no such ground or sufficient motive to believe so, Mr. Doctor taketh upon him to prove, by reasons and inducements which to me seem very weak, and most of them very false; though, truly I must say, that I do not think all this falsity to have proceeded of witting malice or voluntary untruth in the man, as in

* [FIRST EDITION: any article of the Apostles' Creed.]

many former examples of others already handled in the precedent chapters, but rather of oversight and error, as after shall appear. Now then, he, bidding first Catholics to look to their conscience, which may be made erroneous by eight ways —to wit, by *ignorance, negligence, obstinacy, perplexity, pride, singularity, inordinate affection, and pusillanimity* to fear where they needed not,—he cometh to lay down sundry reasons, to shew that Protestants may not be accounted heretics;* whereof the first is the testimony of Cardinal Pole, when he was near his death. *Cardinal Pole* (saith he) *on his death-bed said, the Protestants are the sounder men; I would be a Protestant were it not for the Church of Rome.* This saith Mr. Doctor, but allegeth no testimony besides himself alone; nor, indeed, did I ever hear any such thing mentioned before, though his life and death be extant, written by Duditius and others. Neither seemeth it to be a thing very credible; though, in some sense, his friends perhaps would say that he might speak in jest in that manner. For that if the Church of Rome were not, which he held for the only true, he might be of what church or religion soever he listed. And I doubt not but all those recusants of England, of whom Mr. Doctor maketh this book, will say, every one of them, that, were not the Church of Rome, they would be Protestants, for that it would stand more with their temporal commodity.

Dr. Dove's
proofs why
Protestants
may not be ac-
counted here-
tics.

8. Another reason to prove that Protestants cannot be accounted heretics is this: *That no church can be condemned and judged heretical by any private censure, but it must be public.* But this (saith he) cannot be proved of the Protestant Church: for that, albeit the Council of Trent condemned them, yet many exceptions may be taken against that council, &c. Which seemed unto me but a very slight argument in his behalf, and to give more advantage to his adversary than defence to himself and his cause.

9. A third reason is alleged, and urged much by him:† that the Protestant doctrine is secretly allowed and approved by most learned Papists in their hearts, though outwardly, not to offend, they dissemble the same; and

* *Persuasion*, p. 10.

† *Ibid.* p. 11.

especially this is true in Cardinal Bellarmine, *who in most things* (saith he) *is a Protestant*; yea, and that the Council of Trent did, underhand, justify them. "In that council," saith he, "they set forth such wholesome canons concerning discipline as were fit for a reformed church; but they were not so careful of their points of doctrine, because they saw the world could sooner look into their disorders than judge of their doctrine; which doctrine, although they hold in terms the same which they did before, because princes and estates should not think they had so long deceived the world, &c., yet they set down their conclusions so cunningly, as if they would bear men in hand, that they were in some sort but mistaken, and inclined of themselves unto that which Luther persuaded."

10. This is his narration, which to me verily (to speak the truth) seemed more than half a dream, especially when I saw that which ensueth about Cardinal Bellarmine in particular; of whom he writeth thus: "But now they begin to incline unto us again; insomuch that Cardinal Bellarmine, late divinity reader of Rome, and the learnedest divine of that church which now liveth, in the course of his controversy lectures,* though, where he delivereth the state of the question, he bringeth what may be brought on their side, for fashion sake, that he may avoid all suspicion of heresy with them; yet he handleth his matter so cunningly and so doubtfully, that in his conclusions he agreeth with us in many things, although in divers terms, wherein his predecessors utterly dissented from us; and in many things he sheweth himself to be, so far as he dareth, a Protestant, or, at the least, not a Papist, if we take Papistry to be that which it was before. And whosoever shall observe him well shall find how he discourseth of many things superfluous, like one that is more desirous to deceive the time, to fill up the page with variety of reading, multitudes of fathers, and citations of places, than to refute us."

11. This is Doctor Dove's divination, as it seemeth, of Cardinal Bellarmine's secret meaning, different from his outward writings; for truly, he that shall behold them,

* Page 12.

A very dream
about Cardinal
Bellarmine be-
ing a Protest-
ant.

and see his conclusions, arguments, and inferences against the Protestants, will hardly, I think, say that he doth collude with them. And forsomuch as this doctor telleth us, in the conclusion of his treatise, that he hath answered already nine books of Bellarmine's, to wit, four *de Verbo Dei*, and five *de Christo*, and meaneth to answer all the rest, I was desirous to see his answer that is extant, whereof yet, hitherto, I could get no notice, though he said that it was sent over the sea to print now five years gone. But if Bellarmine do collude indeed, then Mr. Doctor may easily answer his books, at leastwise to his secret meaning; though, for the outward letter, I doubt me he will have much difficulty; for, by all men's judgment, Bellarmine saith much, and very substantially.

12. But now, how truly this general assertion may be avouched of Bellarmine, that he doth collude and make secretly for the Protestants, will appear more clearly in the particulars which he setteth down Bellarmine to have agreement therein with them; as namely, *first, in the controversy* (saith Mr. Doctor) *whether the books of Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, and Wisdom be canonical Scriptures, or not:—the Papists do prove the affirmative out of St. Augustine, we the negative out of St. Jerome; which two fathers, notwithstanding, are thus reconciled: that St. Augustine held them for canonical enough to prove the rules of good life, not grounds of doctrine and faith, whereof St. Jerome understood. And that Bellarmine, since this answer was given, having handled this controversy at large, not once mentioneth this distinction of canons of faith and canons of good life, much less doth he reply against it, and therefore we take it pro concessio.* Thus Mr. Dove.

A very false
cabillation
against Bel-
larmine.

13. But when I went to examine the matter in Bellarmine, I found that he handleth this distinction expressly out of Kemnitius, and refuteth the same, lib. 1 *de Verbo Dei*, cap. 10,* shewing that St. Augustine never knew this double canon of faith and good life; but holdeth generally, that all canonical Scripture is of infallible truth, whether it deliver doctrine of manners or of faith. He sheweth

* Bell. lib. 1 *De Verbo Dei*, cap. 10.

also, that St. Jerome, when he held these books not to be canonical, the cause was not this distinction of *double canons*, but for that the church had not yet decided the difficulty, nor determined them to be canonical; which it did afterward, in the third Council of Carthage, wherein St. Augustine was present; and so I found that Mr. Dove had done not only Bellarmine, but also St. Jerome, open injury in this behalf.

14. Another question followeth, which is this (saith Mr. Dove):* That, forso much as there be many editions of the Bible, as Hebrew, Greek, Latin, it is demanded which is the best? "And we," saith he, "do say the Hebrew, they the Latin; and the Council of Trent hath obtruded unto us one only Latin edition, &c.; but Bellarmine condescendeth to our opinion, as more sound than the decree of the Council of Trent; shewing that wheresoever the Latin books do dissent one from another, they should be examined by the original, which is of greater authority." So Mr. Doctor.

15. But, making my recourse to the place in Bellarmine here cited, *de Verbo Dei*, lib. 2, c. 11, I did find him egregiously abused, as also the Council of Trent;† which council decreeth nothing of the Hebrew or Greek editions, nor compareth them with the Latin translation, nor hindereth men from making recourse unto them; but only determineth that, "*of all the Latin translations*," whereof many were now extant, both of Lutherans, Zuinglians, Anabaptists, and others, the ancient Latin translation, that had endured above a thousand years in the church, which divers men think to have been more ancient than St. Jerome, and to have been reviewed by him, should be preferred and followed, for avoiding innovations and confusion. Nor doth Bellarmine any whit in that place favour the Protestants; but only sheweth that, in certain occasions, when some error in print is doubted, or the Latin translations do differ, or that the meaning of some sentence is ambiguous, or that the propriety of the word or phrase is called in question,

About the old translation.

* Mr. Dove, ubi supra.

† See Concil. Trident. sess. 4, in Decret. &c.

&c., in which four occasions, saith Bellarmine, it is good to recur to the fountains, for conferring divers translations together; but he doth not make comparisons between the originals themselves and their translations. Neither doth the Council of Trent say contrary to this. Wherefore it seemeth to me that Mr. Doctor did not shew the simplicity of a dove in drawing Bellarmine, against his own words, sense, and meaning, to favour him.

16. Another question is, saith he, whether all things necessary to salvation be contained in the Scriptures; wherein he saith of Bellarmine, "Being, as it were, ashamed of the old Papists' assertion that the Bible was insufficient, doth relinquish it. And after he hath spoken in the defence of traditions what he can, concludeth that all things which are necessary are contained in the Apostles' writings." But when I looked upon Bellarmine, I discovered a notable fraud; for that Bellarmine, in this very place alleged, having proved first abundantly that all things necessary to salvation are not contained in Scriptures, doth, by way of answering an objection out of St. Irenæus, say, that such things as are necessary to all and every man's salvation to be known and believed, *fide explicita* (by express faith), whether he be learned or unlearned; as the creed, ten commandments, and some sacraments, were left written also by the apostles; but not all other things that are necessary to be taught and believed by the church. Bellarmine's words are these:—*Dico illa omnia scripta ab apostolis quæ sunt omnibus necessaria, et quæ ipsi palàm omnibus vulgò prædicaverunt; alia autem non omnia scripta esse**—"I say that all those things which are necessary to all men for their salvation, and which the apostles preached publicly to all and every man, for their salvation, were left written by the apostles; but other things, that are not so necessary to all men (especially to the simple and ignorant), were not all written, but left rather by tradition." Which words and sentence when I had considered, together with Bellarmine's long discourse explicating himself, I saw no one thing

All things necessary to every man's salvation are written in the Scripture.

* Bell. l. 4 De Verbo Dei, cap. 11.

which made for the part of Mr. Doctor Dove; and I could not marvel sufficiently to see him bring in Bellarmine so often as favouring the Protestants, especially in two points: the one, that it is lawful to dissent from the Council of Trent; the other, about *purgatory*; holding that it is not in Scripture; which are both of them mere cavils. For, albeit that Bellarmine doth say that an heretic doth sin in not believing the church,* and in particular the Council of Trent, in that which they prescribe unto him; yet, supposing this sin once committed, it is no new offence to examine whether the places of Scriptures and fathers alleged by the same council be truly alleged or no, so he do it, saith Bellarmine, with intention to seek out the truth, and not to calumniate. Which seemed to me a very simple ground to make Cardinal Bellarmine a Protestant in that controversy.

About purgatory.

17. As also in the next, about *purgatory*, wherein Mr. Dove seemed to me to have turned himself into a serpent indeed, if notable dissimulation do seem rather to appertain to a serpent than to a dove; for he will needs avouch Cardinal Bellarmine to confess that *purgatory is not contained in Scripture*, but only delivered by tradition.† *We dare not affirm (saith he) that souls departed are in purgatory; sith purgatory, by the confession of Bellarmine, is a tradition, and not contained in Scriptures.*‡ So he. But when I went to Bellarmine's two books written of *purgatory*, I found him to bestow six whole chapters of his first book in alleging Scriptures, with exposition of ancient fathers upon the same, for the proof thereof; ten out of the Old Testament and nine out of the New; whereat when I had marvelled much, I returned to Mr. Dove, to see how he would prove his assertion that Bellarmine made such a confession.

18. And, albeit he had not cited the place in Bellarmine where we should find it, as not desirous, I suppose, to have his bad dealing known in this behalf; yet, by the circumstance of the things mentioned, I found it out in his fourth book *de Verbo Dei*.§ Mr. Dove's charge is this:

* De Verbo Dei, lib. 3, cap. 10.

† De Purgat. l. 1, c. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

‡ Persuasion, pp. 21, 22.

§ Ibidem.

Bellarmino writeth (quoth he) that there be many things necessary to be known, which are not contained in the Scriptures; whereof he reckoneth up an eleven in order, of which the last is purgatory; whereby he affirmeth that purgatory is a thing necessary to be known, and not in the Scripture; and yet, as a man that would halt between two religions, to please us, and not to displease the Papists, he doth lay it upon Luther, saying: Luther saith he believeth that there is a purgatory, and yet saith that it cannot be proved out of Scripture. But the question is, whether Bellarmine doth not say so as well as Luther; for if he do not, why doth he, in that long catalogue of such things as are not contained in Scriptures, reckon purgatory to be the eleventh? &c. Thus far he. And now must we discover the ridiculous bad dealing used in this charge.

19. True it is that Cardinal Bellarmine, in the place cited, to prove that many things were believed in the church that are not expressly in the Scriptures, setteth down twelve examples, whereof the tenth is, that as well Protestants as Catholics do hold the baptism of infants to be lawful and necessary, against the Anabaptists; which, notwithstanding, is not contained in Scriptures. The eleventh is *ad hominem*, against Luther in particular, in these words: *Undecimò, credit Lutherus purgatorium esse; sic enim ait in Assertionibus articulo trigesimo septimo: 'Ego tamen et credo purgatorium esse, et consulo suadeoque credendum.' Et tamen articulo illo trigesimo septimo asserit, purgatorium non posse probari ex sacris literis**—"In the eleventh place, Luther doth believe that there is a purgatory; for so he saith in the thirty-seventh article of his Assertions: 'I, notwithstanding, do believe that there is a purgatory, and do both counsel and persuade men to believe it.' And yet in the same article he saith, purgatory cannot be proved out of Holy Scripture; and therefore some things are to be believed which are not expressed in Holy Writ." So saith Bellarmine.

20. This argument, you see, is taken out of Luther, against Lutherans and Protestants that do deny any thing necessarily to be believed that is not in Scripture: and no

* Bellar. l. 4 De Verbo Dei, cap. 4.

one word is here spoken by Bellarmine as of himself, for his own opinion; which we have now seen, out of his books of purgatory, to be quite contrary to that which Mr. Doctor Dove affirmeth; to wit, that the doctrine of purgatory standeth not only upon tradition, but is founded also upon nineteen different authorities of Holy Scripture, by him alleged for the same. How impudent, then, and shameless is Mr. Dove, who concludeth his false asseveration in these words: "As Luther denieth purgatory to be contained in the Scriptures, so doth Bellarmine, or else he doth contradict himself, which said before, *Purgatorium est undecimum eorum quæ ignorari non possunt, et tamen in Scripturis non continentur*—" Purgatory is the eleventh of those things whereof we may not be ignorant, and yet are not contained in the Scriptures." Which words he allegeth, as you see, in Latin, and in a different letter, as uttered by Bellarmine; which are nowhere to be found in him, neither can by any man of sense, who understandeth only what he readeth, be deduced out of Bellarmine's discourse and meaning, or be once imagined to be uttered affirmatively by him, as Mr. Dove avoucheth. Let, then, the discreet reader judge what ground or reason Mr. Dove had to play upon Bellarmine in this place, saying, *that, as a man that would halt between two religions, he doth lay the matter upon Luther, &c.* Which manner of fond and false trifling did displease me so much, as I would go no further in the examination of his books; but thought with myself, if this man have answered already nine of Bellarmine's books, as he saith, and have answered them in this sort, as here he doth, by plain fiction and falsification of his words, drift, and meaning, it will be good pastime for the world to read his answers, and will administer much matter to Gretserus, Andreas Græcus, and other such learned men in Germany and Italy as do profess to defend Bellarmine's works against all impugnors.

21. And hereupon I resolved to pass no further in examination of this book, considering, notwithstanding, with myself, in what case he had left the state of the question and controversy which he took upon him, with our English recusants; to wit, in far worse case, to my seeming,

than when he began with them. For that, first, having granted unto them, as you have heard, that no man may do any thing against his conscience, though the thing were never so good or lawful, so long as that repugnance of conscience endureth; and then, further, that no communication or participation in church or divine service is to be held or admitted with them that our conscience holdeth to be in schism or heresy, he leaveth the matter only upon this point,* whether the said recusants have sufficient cause to frame unto themselves such a conscience upon Protestant doctrine;† wherein, notwithstanding he helpeth them out yet further for discerning what is heretical and what is not, saying, as before you have heard: *No church can be condemned and adjudged heretical by any private censure, but it must be public; and therefore they allege (saith he)‡ for our condemnation, the decrees of the Council of Trent; against the authority of which council we take these just exceptions: First, that they call it a general council, as if almost all the divines of the world had been assembled there. Let us, therefore, number how many were present, &c.* So e. Where you see he granteth that, if the judgment of the Council of Trent, that condemned and adjudged Protestant religion for heretical, was no private censure, but public sentence and condemnation—for that they represented the body of the whole Roman Church at that time, though the most part of the divines of the world were not here (which they will say is not necessary to make a general council);—then granteth he, in effect, that these recusants have sufficient reasons and motives to found their consciences thereupon. And so for that he seemed to say very little for himself, but rather to help the cause of his adversaries, in the principal point of controversy, I had little list to proceed any further in this view, though there were many points that allured me to stand longer upon them, especially certain conclusions of his upon former discourses.

22. As for example, after his debating the matter, whether Protestants may be touched § with heresy and schism

The state of the question left doubtful by Mr. Doctor.

* Page 3.

† Page 5.

‡ Page 14.

§ [*i. e.* charged.]

or no, he useth these words : *Therefore, I exhort them that hold us for heretics first to read diligently, to peruse and examine their own writers, and what they hold; to confer their grounds with ours, and then to examine their own judgment, whether they find us heretics or no.** Whereunto the Catholics will answer, first, that they have already done so, and have found them to be such in their judgment;

Mr. Dove's
rule to try he-
resp.

and, secondly, that this is no general or secure rule to try heretics or heresy; for that un-

learned men and women cannot use these means of reading, perusing, examining, conferring grounds, and the like. And, therefore, if God have left no other means but this of discerning heresy and heretics, then many infinite people fall therinto without remedy. But if we will follow the Catholic rule, say they, of discerning

The Catholic
rule to try
heresp.

heretics, by their dissenting from the universal visible Christian church, and by their condemnation from the same (which they hold to be the only rule of ancient fathers for distinguishing heretics from Catholics); then, say they, is the matter more easy to judge and discern, even by the most unlearned people, for that as St. Augustine saith: No man can choose but see the universal visible church, no more than he can to see the sun at noonday, when it shineth clearest, except he will obstinately shut his eyes. Nay, he addeth further, that they are blind that cannot see it.—Which is a more speedier way to discern the matter of heresy than Mr. Dove's rule of perusing, examining, conferring grounds, &c.†

23. Another like conclusion he useth, page 27, after his exhortation to Catholic recusants for joining with him and his in common prayers. *Concerning our common prayers (saith he), if they do well look over their own missal or mass book which was used in England according to the custom of Sarum, and confer it with our service-book, they shall find that there are few things in it, but they are either taken out of the Bible, or out of that*

Whence the
English ser-
vice-book is
compacted.

* Page 18.

† August. l. 2, contra Petil. c. 32, et lib. de Unit. Eccles. c. 14, et Tract. 24 in Epist. Joannis.

missal; so that they cannot easily mistake our service-book, unless they will condemn the best part of their own mass-book and Bible. So then they may safely come to our church, &c. And here now I found the Catholics to laugh at this wise declaration, that the English service-book, being made up for the most part of the Sarum mass-book and the Bible, cannot be evil or prejudicial to Catholics in coming unto it. Whereas it is evident, that if all were taken out of the Bible itself (as most of all heretical service hath been in every age pretended to be), yet might the collection or combination be such as might make it unlawful and pestiferous; as when the Arians did sing, *Gloria Patri cum Filio*, and *per Filium*, and the Catholics *et Filio*, the difference in sound of words was small, but in substance and malice execrable. This invitement then unto recusants seemed to me to be very slender.

24. There followeth another, and with this I will end. He saith that there is a great union among them in matters of religion and no division; and consequently recusants may easily reconcile themselves unto them: * *This objection* (saith he) *against us was wont to be that we have sects and divisions among us; but so had they oftentimes: Eckius against Pighius, Thomas against Scotus; so had the apostles, Peter against Paul, and Paul against Barnabas, and some were of Paul, and some of Apollo, and some of Cephas. We contend about white and black, round and square, but in matters of religion we agree.* In which triple instance the Catholics

Of the agreement of Protestants.

do note a triple absurdity; to wit, in the first, ignorance or folly; for that the differences or contentions betwixt Eckius, Pighius, Thomas, and Scotus were only in matters disputable, and not determined by the church for points of faith; in the second, great impiety, for that the apostles' contentions were not about matters of different doctrine, which had been injurious to the Holy Ghost that governed them; in the third, they note ridiculous audacity, to deny so absolutely any disagreement in matters of religion to be among them; whereof notwithstanding the whole world can be witness to the contrary out of their own books,

* Persuasion, p. 31.

censures, and invectives, the one against the other; * wherein they refer the reader to Rescius's "Ministromachia," that is, the fight among the ministers; Jurgivitiuſ, in his *Bellum quinti Evangelii*—the war of contention among the professors of the fifth Gospel; and to Coccius's eighth book and first tome of "Thesaurus," and others of that argument; whereof we have also given divers examples before.

[25. Concerning these objections and accusations made against Mr. Dove, I thought good to advertise thee, gentle reader, that whereas he hath pretended to make an answer or some colourable excuse for himself alone, leaving his fellow-ministers to answer every man for himself; his excuses I have already refelled and rejected as insufficient, and also very faulty, which refutation I intended to have inserted here in this place, but that the number of new faults and falsehoods in Mr. Dove's excuses (though his pamphlet contain but six leaves only) increased in such manner, as I was enforced to insist upon my reply thereunto far longer than at the first I intended, and so it grew to a greater volume than was convenient to overcharge the bulk of this book withal; but it is now expecting the press, and I hope you shall have it very shortly.]

* See before, part 2, c. 3.

CHAPTER XII.

What I found in Mr. Thomas Rogers's Book of the Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England, contained in Thirty-nine Articles agreed upon by the English Clergy.

NEXT unto the former, I took up by chance into my hands a book, entitled "The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion professed and protected in the Realm of England and Dominions of the same, expressed in Thirty-nine Articles, agreed upon by the Reverend Bishops and Clergy of this Kingdom in two several Meetings upon the years 1562 and 1604, perused by the lawful Authority of the Church of England, and allowed to be public, Anno Domini 1607." The setter forth of this book is one *Thomas Rogers*, poor chaplain (as he saith) to the *Lord's Grace of Canterbury*, to whom he writeth a very large preface, professing to shew the great unity of doctrine that is and hath been still in all churches of the reformed religion; and yet, in the prosecution of his narration, he seemeth to me to do nothing so much as to lay forth their dissensions and disagreements. For that he setting down in his fourth page, that the true doctrine was restored in England upon the year 1558, by the entrance of Queen Elizabeth to the crown, and confirmed four years after by the bishops and clergy upon the year 1562 (in which time he allegeth Beza, saying, *Doctrinæ puritas purè et sincerè viget in Anglia**— "the purity of doctrine doth flourish purely and sincerely in England"), he steppeth but ten years further, to wit, to the year 1572, wherein he confesseth great stirs, dissensions, and divisions in doctrine to have been among them, so far forth as the said Thirty-nine Articles, ten

The beginning
of stirs in
England among
the Protestants
about their doctrine.

* Page 6.

years before agreed upon, were refused to be subscribed by many of their ministers and clergy: *Divers of the inferior ministers* (saith he) *in and about London and elsewhere in this kingdom not a little disturbed the quiet of our state and peace, some of them by untimely and inconsiderate admonitions, pamphlets, and libels; others by obstinate refusing to subscribe as both law did enjoin and their fathers in Christ and superiors before them had done.** So he.

The importance of matters controverted between Puritans and Protestants.

And from that time forward he goeth on shewing how that division continually increased among them. And to the end we should not think that they were trifles for which they contended, he citeth divers speeches of the new dissenting brethren concerning the importance of their difference. *That it is a part of the Gospel itself; and if every hair of their heads were a life, they ought to afford them in defence of those matters. That the articles of religion penned and agreed upon by the bishops, and ratified by the prince and parliament, were but childish toys in respect of those their affairs.†* And yet further, *that their contentions were not about a cap or tippet, but for great matters concerning a true ministry and regimen of the church according to the word; whereof the first would never be till the bishops were down, nor the second until kings and queens did subject themselves unto the church, &c.*

2. And then he goeth forward to shew how these articles here set down by the bishops of their Catholic doctrine ‡ were again refused to be subscribed unto by the Puritan brethren upon the year 1584, which they termed (saith he) the woful year of subscription, but confirmed by Queen Elizabeth's proclamation upon the year 1588, and the brethren denounced thereby to be schismatical; but that they began again more fiercely then ever before upon the year 1595, by setting forth printed books, especially those brethren that were called Sabbathines: for that among other their doctrines, abandoning all other holy days, they did teach the Sabbath day (which they call the Lord's day) to be observed with no less rigour than the Jews themselves: about which point this minister, Thomas

* Preface, p. 10.

† Page 11.

‡ Page 9.

Rogers, doth set down an observation of his own in these words.

3. "I have read (and many there be alive which will justify it) how it was preached in a market town, in Oxfordshire,* that to do any servile work or business on the Lord's day is as great a sin as to kill a man or to commit adultery; it was preached in Somersetshire, that to throw a bowl on the Sabbath day is as great a sin as to kill a man; it was preached in Norfolk, that to make a feast or wedding dinner on the Lord's day is as great a sin as for the father to take a knife and cut his child's throat; it was preached in Suffolk, I can name the man, and I was present when he was convented before his ordinary for preaching the same, that to ring more bells than one upon the Lord's day to call the people unto church is as great a sin as to commit murder."

4. And thus writeth Mr. Rogers, and sheweth furthermore that this dissension continued unto the queen's death, as also in the days of this king; and yet, notwithstanding, from time to time, he saith that the English church is in great unity of doctrine, and that these points contain not any substantial difference; which I confess that I understand not, as I do not also this other point set down in the first page of his book, to wit, that the foresaid Thirty-nine Articles of their *Catholic Protestant religion* (for so he calleth them) agreed upon by the clergy of England, are not only conform to the word of God, but to all the Confessions that are extant, of all the neighbour churches Christianly reformed. But when I went to look upon sundry of those confessions of foreign Protestant countries, I found them most evidently disagreeing in many points; as, namely, the Lutheran Church of Saxony, Denmark, and Sweden; the Zuinglians of Switzerland, the Calvinists of Geneva, France, Holland, and other places; so as this seemed to me a strange manner of dealing to profess unity, and yet to lay forth nothing but disunion; for which cause this large preface did nothing content me.

5. But much less after that I came to view the book itself, and the Thirty-nine Articles

About Christ's
descending into
hell.

* Preface, p. 18.

therein contained ; for that they seemed to me nothing substantially handled. As, for example, in the third article, of Christ's going down into hell, p. 15. I desired to see what the bishops had decreed, which is set down in these words: *As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell.** No more than this do I find written ; but Mr. Rogers, that taketh upon him to analyze every article into propositions, and to prove them out of Scriptures, writeth thus: *That Christ went down into hell* (saith he) *all sound Christians, both of former times and now living, do acknowledge ; albeit, in the interpretation of the article, there is not that consent which were to be wished ; some holding that Christ descended into hell as God only, some as man only ; and that either in body alone, or soul alone, some as God and man in one person.* So he. But which of all these senses and interpretations his Church of England holdeth, or whether she holdeth either of them, or neither of them, he telleth us not. And is not this a strange way of teaching unity and conformity in substantial matters of belief ? Or is not this article of our creed a substantial matter ?

6. But let us go forward. Though he determine nothing what himself or the English Church doth believe in this matter ; yet he doth put himself and his church in opposition against certain adversaries in these words: *Good guides, no doubt, to Christian souls, who understand not themselves the Apostles' Creed.* *But until we know the native and undoubted sense of this article, and mystery of religion, we shall persist adversaries unto them who say that Christ descended not into hell at all, &c. ; and that say that Christ descended into the place of the everlasting torments, where his soul endured, for a time, the very pains which the damned spirits do abide, &c.*

7. In which words I considered, first, that he confesseth that the Church of England knoweth not the native and undoubted sense of this article, and consequently she cannot well direct others therein ; nor can she be the pillar

and foundation of truth, as St. Paul calleth the true church, in that which she knoweth not herself.

8. Secondly, I considered that the errors and adversaries against whom he setteth himself here, quoting in the margin Carliele, Banister, Paget, Humes, Gifford, and others, in their new catechisms, and other treatises, are Protestant writers. And so also was Mr. Calvin, whose opinion was the second error here mentioned (of Christ's suffering the torments of the damned, and that he felt horrible anguish of conscience), though Mr. Rogers craftily, for saving his honour, pretermitted to name him, as may appear, lib. 2 "Instit.," cap. 16, secs. 8, 9, 10, 11, and in divers other places of his works, as "Catechismo parvo in Psycopanichia," and in "Harmonia Evangelica," ad cap. 7 Matthæi, &c. So as if the Church of England be adversary, in this article, to all these Protestants of her own profession, then where is the union and conformity, both at home and abroad, which this man so much pretendeth? How doth the English profession agree also with all other neighbour churches Christianly reformed? Or how truly saith Dr. Dove, *We contend about white and black, round and square, but in matters of religion we agree?**

9. And whereas, after other adversaries, now mentioned, of his own profession (among whom also he might have numbered Mr. William Perkins, in his exposition of the Creed, citing the Rhemish Testament, Luke xvi. 26, who setteth out four expositions, with intention to make choice, as he saith, of the best, though not agreeing with Mr. Rogers), he setteth down for erroneous the dream (as he calleth it) of the Papists, that believe that Christ's soul went down into hell, and there out of the prison called *Limbus Patrum*, or "Abraham's bosom," delivered the patriarchs and other holy men that were there, expecting Christ's coming, to be delivered thence. But this dream, upon examination, I found to be (for the substance thereof) the belief [of St. Augustine, in Epistola 99, whom the Rhemists cited, as also] of the whole rank of ancient fathers, of whom, besides other writers, Bel-

* Dove's Persuasion, p. 31 et supra, c. 11.

larmine* doth allege eight-and-twenty to make evidently for the same, and to prove their belief out of six plain places of Scripture, which he allegeth. So as for Mr. Rogers to set down nothing what he or his church believed in this article, and to hold for a dream that which the Roman Church with so great consent of antiquity doth teach, seemed a very simple point, if it may be called simplicity.

10. But, yet further, the last point of all that he writeth about this matter seemed not a simplicity, but a duplicity; or rather manifest falsehood; when he writeth that the Papists hold that Christ, by his descension, had quite turned hell into paradise, citing Costerus, the Jesuit, for the same, lib. 5 "Institut.," which made me muse for a time, thinking whether the Papists taught now that there

Costerus
abused by Mr.
Rogers.

was no more hell at all. But when I had perused the place of Costerus, I found an egregious fraud. For that part or place only into which our Saviour's soul descended, and out of which he delivered the ancient fathers of the Old Testament, that there, as in a prison, expected his coming; which dark prison (saith Costerus) he so lightened with his glorious presence, *ut tenebrosum carcerem in paradisum verteret*—"as he turned that dark prison into a paradise" (during the time of his being there), according to that which he had promised to the good thief, that he should be with him that very day in paradise. So as I saw the whole sense and meaning of Costerus here perverted, and a new article of belief thereby imposed upon him, and all those of his religion, which perhaps they never thought of; to wit, that hell was become a paradise; whereby I saw that Mr. Rogers was no *trusty-Roger* in this his relation.

11. But now, to go a little further. The sixth article of *consent*, brought forth here, as agreed upon by our English bishops, is about canonical Scriptures, the books, and sufficiency thereof; and, after certain exceptions taken against some books of the Old Testament, they say for the New thus: *All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them for canonical*:† which verdict, when I had considered, I

* Bellar. l. 4. De Anima Christi, c. 12 et 14.

† Page 27.

marvelled why they had not set down a catalogue of their names, as they had done of those books of the Old Testament. And, to confess the truth, I began to suspect some fraud therein, especially for that those words, *as they are commonly received, we do receive them*, may have divers senses. For it may be understood that they receive them as they are commonly received by the greater part of men throughout Christendom, both of Papists and Protestants; but this is not true, as presently will appear. Or that they do receive them as commonly they are received among all those of the Protestant profession; but neither this is true. For, if we go to particulars, we shall see that our ordinary English Bible hath the Epistle to the Hebrews as canonical Scripture, and written by St. Paul, which yet Mr. Luther doth stoutly deny, saying, *that it was neither written by St. Paul, nor with any apostolical spirit, for that it containeth some things contrary to the apostolical and evangelical doctrine.** And of the same opinion with Luther, were the two famous men, Brentius and Kemnitius; and after them again, the Magdeburgians.† And the very same they hold in the same places of the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude, rejecting them wholly, which yet our English Protestants do hold for apostolical, and written by the Holy Ghost. Of the second Epistle of St. Peter, and second and third of St. John, the said Lutheran doctors do doubt in like manner.‡ And as for the book of Apocalypse, or Revelation, Luther saith in the "Prologue" thereof, that he findeth something wanting therein. But in his more ancient "Preface to the New Testament," he protesteth that he doth not receive it, either for an evangelical or apostolical book. And with him doth agree Brentius, as also Kemnitius,§ though the Magdeburgians in this do leave Luther, and join with Calvin.

12. Now then, this being so, I considered with myself what agreement there could be in this point between the Church of England and that of Saxony, Denmark, Nor-

* Luth. in præm. in Epist. ad Hebræos.

† In Confess. Wittemb. c. de sacra Script.

‡ In Exam. fourth sess. Con. Trid.

§ Cent. 1. l. 2. cap. 4.

way, Sweden, and other Lutheran churches. *Christianly reformed*, as they will say; and we English will not deny it in other occasions, when they agree with us; though in this now, about the books of canonical Scriptures, the difference is such, as I saw not how it might be accorded; no, nor yet the controversy itself of sufficiency of Scriptures; for that to these Lutheran churches that reject the aforesaid books, the rest of the Scripture must needs seem sufficient; which cannot so seem to our English Church, except we will judge these for superfluous. And if these may be cut off, and yet the rest remain sufficient, then

A demand concerning the sufficiency of Holy Scripture.

would I demand of other books, as of all St. John's Gospel, for example, if it should be taken away, whether the other three Gospels were sufficient, and had all things necessary to salvation; whereas they want many points of great weight and moment, which St. John's Gospel supplieth; as, of the divinity of Christ, in the first chapter; the miracle of changing water into wine; the raising of Lazarus; the long sermon after the supper, and others.

13. And if any will say that the taking away of St. John's Gospel will make the other three insufficient, then how did the Christian Church, for sixty-five years after Christ's ascension, in which time St. John's Gospel was not written, though we must suppose that, in that time, all necessary points of faith therein contained, which were not in the other, were believed by tradition, though not written. So as it seemeth that this sufficiency of the Scriptures, that is to say, the written word, without all unwritten traditions, is a very hard point to be defended with probability, forsomuch as neither, without some tradition, can it be known which is scripture and which is not; as now in part you have seen.

14. I do not mean to run over all the Thirty-nine Articles agreed upon by Protestant churches, as Mr. Rogers avoucheth, for that it would require a whole volume; but yet, by so much as I have perused thereof, it seemeth that infinite advantage might be taken against him in the principal point now in question—of untrue dealing—if any man would exactly and at large discuss the same,

especially in two general heads: the one, that of all these Thirty-nine Articles very few will be found, wherein the Protestant churches and writers thereof do fully agree among themselves, if they dissent from the Papists; and the second, that where he doth in every article set down the Papists' opinions different from the Protestants', he doth commonly, or very ordinarily, falsify either their assertions or writers, to make them to speak and teach absurdly. Some few examples shall serve to demonstrate the matter.

15. In the ninth article, which is of original * or birth sin, the English clergy doth set down this proposition: *That original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man; that nature is engendered of the offspring of Adam, &c.* But how will Mr. Rogers defend that there is no disagreement amongst Protestants in this article? Let the reader peruse the conflict of books that have been written between Matthew Illyricus,† Joannes Vigandus,‡ Tilmanus Heshusius,§ and Martinus Kemnitius,|| all Protestant writers, about this point; Illyricus holding and obstinately defending, that original sin is not any accident, but absolutely the substance of the soul infected therewith; for proof whereof he allegeth Martin Luther¶ himself in divers parts of his works, and all the other foresaid authors, though differently and disagreeingly, yet in most eager manner impugning the same, which Calvin also doth and all those that follow him.

16. Furthermore, there is no small dissension between Protestant authors, whether original sin be actual sin, according to those words of Luther: ** *Fomes verè est actuale peccatum*—"Concupiscence (or original corruption) is truly actual sin;" with whom doth concur Melancthon, in his Common-places, set forth Anno Domini 1522 and 1540, and Mart. Kemnitius, in "Examen, Sess. 5, Concil. Trident.," from which opinion, notwithstanding, do dissent not only Catholics, but Calvinists also; as they do in like

* Page 41.

† Lib. 5 De Natura Peccat. Origin.

‡ In Proposit. de Peccat. Ori. 119.

§ Lib. De Peccat. Ori.

|| In Exam. Con. Trid. sess. 5, p. 454.

¶ Com. in c. 3 Genes. et in explic. Psalm L.

** In Assert. art. 3.

manner from the impious opinion of Zuinglius,* who denied original sin to be truly sin, but only a sickness and defect: *Utut fremant pontificii* (saith he) *peccatum originale nihil aliud esse dicimus, quam morbum*—"Howsoever the Papists do fret against me for the same, I do say that original sin is nothing else but a sickness," &c. And again, in the same place: *Unde colligimus peccatum originale morbum quendam esse, qui tamen per se culpabilis non est, nec damnationis pœnam inferre potest: utcumque hic nobis theologorum disputationes et sententiæ reclamitent*—"Whereof we do gather that original sin is a sickness, but yet not culpable of itself, nor can it damn a man: albeit, here I know that the disputations and verdicts of school-divines will cry out against us for this opinion."† So he. And here, I trow, Mr. Rogers will not deny but that his church also and his divines will cry out in like manner against this opinion of Zuinglius; and, consequently, in this article of original sin, there is not that union and conformity between *England and other neighbour churches Christianly reformed*, as he pretendeth. And so he speaketh untruly in the first head of this ninth article. What were we like to find, if we would peruse the other thirty? Let us see the second head, whether he speak any more truly therein.

17. He maketh, in the second head, the Papists to be his adversaries in five or six points at the least; but all so set down as that in every one there is some kind of fraud or great impertinency. The first is this,‡ *that Papists say, that original sin is of all the least sin, and less than any venial sin*: citing only in the margin "Tapper, Tract. de Pecc. Orig.," without quoting any page or paragraph; which treatise, being large, required some labour to peruse it over, but in the end I found it, page 467 of the Lovain edition, and therewithal discovered bad dealing, if he understood the author, whose words out of St. Thomas and Altisiodorensis are these: *Peccatum originale quamvis maximum sit malum, quia totius naturæ corruptio; minimum tamen est peccatum, et minus minimo peccato veniali*

* Zuing. l. de Baptis. Tract. 3, et in Comm. c. 5 ad Rom.

† Ibid. inferius.

‡ Page 43.

—"Though original sin be the greatest evil that may be, for that is the corruption of all man's nature (descending from Adam), yet it is the least sin, and less than the least venial sin." The reason whereof is, for that it is not properly voluntary, nor proceedeth from man's will, but descendeth by succession and by necessity from our first parents, in whom it is voluntary, but in us not.* And forsomuch as in the nature of sin, according to St. Augustine's sentence,† it is principally required that it be voluntary (which every venial sin is, and original sin is not), therefore, though in regard of the evil which it bringeth generally to all mankind, it be the greatest evil, yet in respect that it is not voluntary, it may be called the least sin. Which doctrine, being thus explained and understood, cannot be carpied at with any probability of reason at all.

18. The second error and absurdity which he ascribeth unto Papists is, that they say, *that original sin is only the debt of punishment for the sin of Adam, and not his fault.*‡ And for this he citeth the same Tapper, in the same place; but here also seemed to me to be more malice than in the former. For that Tapper, in the selfsame place, doth not only not say that we receive the only punishment from Adam without his fault, but the plain contrary, that we do receive both *maculam* and *reatum*—"the blot and guilt" of his fault. And furthermore addeth, *quod ex ejus peccato Deo sumus odibiles in nobismetipsis, et filii iræ*—"that by Adam's sin we become hateful to God in ourselves, and the children of wrath."§ And will not Mr.

* [Et quia minimum hic est de voluntario, quia solum voluntarium aliena, principii scilicet naturæ, voluntate, et hac indirecta tantum et interpretativa ...per hoc quod Adam illud elegit, cui justitiæ carentia et expulsio erat annexa : et solum in habitu consistit, qui dum malus est, incomparabiliter est minus malus quam ejus actus : *Ideo docet idem B. Thomas post Wilhelmum Altisiodorensem...* quod peccatum originale, quamvis maximum sit malum, quia totius naturæ corruptio, minimum tamen est peccatum et minus minimo peccato veniali.—These remarks are incidental only to a discussion on another subject. What Tapper held on the effect of Adam's transgression on all his posterity will appear presently. It may be added here that this Flemish divine assisted at the Council of Trent.]

† August. lib. Retr. cap. 13, et lib. de Vera Religione, c. 14, Paulo, inferius.

‡ Ubi supra.

§ [In fact, he says more. Nos, inquam, non solum bonis quæ per Adam

Rogers be ashamed here to impose such things upon his adversaries, whereof they hold the quite contrary?

19. His third imputation to Papists in this matter is, that they say, *that original sin is not properly sin*; and this, out of the same Tapper, he allegeth as a heinous crime; but now you have heard the justification of this position to the explication of his first objection, to wit, that original sin is not so properly sin (though it be a great evil), for that it is not voluntary in us; and he allegeth for his assertion two general councils, one very ancient, called Arausicanum, cap. 2,* and the other of Trent; so as this hath no inconvenience in it at all, as neither the next that ensueth: *That such as are infected only with original sin* (these are his words) *are free from all sensible punishment.*† Which is to say, that such as die void of all actual sin, and are only guilty of original, as infants before baptism, shall only suffer *pœnam damni*; that is, the punishment of losing the sight of God everlastingly in the next world, and not *pœnam census*, that is, the sensible punishment of torments, as other damned people shall do for

eramus percepturi, spoliatur, sed et impietatem participamus, qua ipsi in nobis culpabiles et Deo abominabiles constituimur paterna impietate in nos transfusa et manente, donec sanguine Christi in baptismo ablatur: quod omnis creaturæ excedit intellectum, quod scilicet in eo solum non in nobis peccamus, constituamur tamen non in parente tantum sed in nobismetipsis peccatores.—*Id.*]

* [i. e. of Arausio, or Orange, in Provence. An. 529. This council, although of high authority, is inaccurately called a *general* council. Its definition was adopted, as Tapper remarks, word for word by the general Council of Trent. Si quis Adæ provaricationem sibi soli et non ejus propagini asserit nocuisse: et acceptam a Deo sanctitatem et justitiam quam perdidit, sibi soli et non nobis etiam eum perdidisse: aut inquinatum illum per inobedientiæ peccatum, mortem et pœnas corporis tantum in omne genus humanum transfudisse, non autem et peccatum quod mors est animæ, anathema sit. [Compare Labbe xiv. 751 and iv. 1667.] Hence Tapper infers that “original sin is not *properly* sin;” original sin being described as “the death of the soul,” whereas “sin properly so called is rather the *cause* of that death, and that which is personal (*proprium*) to each one.” P. 74. It should, however, be observed that the Council of Trent, in the canon immediately following that just cited (sess. v. can. 3), adopts the word in question:—Adæ peccatum, quod origine unum est, et propagatione non imitatione transfusum omnibus, inest unicuique *proprium*. But the discrepancy, perhaps, is rather apparent than real. The council is glancing at the Pelagian heresy and the notion of mere “imputation.” And Tapper has refuted both the one and the other.

† *bid.* p. 43.

actual sins; and this point of doctrine, if Mr. Rogers had known, which is common in the schoolmen's books, he would never have brought in so impertinent an imputation to charge them with error or absurdity.

20. I let pass the fifth objected error, that he objecteth about the Blessed Virgin, in these words: *The Papists do affirm (saith he) that some persons, and, namely, the Virgin Mary, is free from original sin.** But when I examined the matter itself, I found in the Council of Trent† that they do not affirm *some persons*, in the plural number, but singularly, and only the mother of God, to have been freed by the singular privilege, prerogative, and grace of her son, from the actual guilt of original sin, whereinto she had fallen, as all others do, had not this privilege prevented the same; and yet hath not the church determined this, as the said Council of Trent expressly affirmeth, but hath left it free for all parties to believe as they think best therein. So as in this imputation there is neither sincerity nor moment, and, therefore, I will pass to the last about this matter.

21. In his 46th page he setteth down this for an error of the Papists, against which he saith, that he and his church doth fight. *The Church of Rome (saith he) decreeth how concupiscence is not sin, but proceedeth from sin and inclineth unto sin.* And for this he citeth the Council of Trent, sess. 5. But when I went to peruse the place, I found that they were St. Augustine's words, again and again repeated by him in divers parts of his works,‡ as namely, against Julian the Pelagian, where he saith, that albeit the apostle St. Paul, in the 7th chapter to the Romans, do call concupiscence sin, yet was it *quia peccato facta est, si consentientem traxerit atque illexerit concipit, paritque peccatum.*—It was called sin by the apostle, for that it is made of sin (as the effect of original sin), and for that, if it draw and allure a man to consent, then doth it conceive and bring forth sin, but not otherwise. And, in another place: *Hæc carnis concupiscentia, etiamsi vocatur peccatum; non utique quia peccatum est, sed quia peccato facta est, sic vocatur; sicut scriptura manus cujus-*

* Page 45.

† Con. Trid. sess. 5, init.

‡ Lib. 6, c. 11.

*que dicitur, quòd manus eam fecerit.** That is, “But this concupiscence of flesh (remaining after baptism), though it be called sin; yet is it so called, not for that it is sin, but for that it is made (in us) by sin, and doth proceed from sin; even as every man’s writing is called his hand, because it is made by the hand.”

22. So St. Augustine for expounding St. Paul, that calleth it sin; but for the matter itself, that without consent of heart it is not sin indeed, his words are clear: *Ipsa quidem concupiscentia jam non est peccatum in regeneratis, quando illi ad illicita opera non consentitur* †—“Concupiscence itself is now no sin in the regenerate, when consent is not given thereunto to commit unlawful works.” Which seeming to me to be the selfsame words which Mr. Rogers objecteth for gross errors unto the Roman Church, I could not but wonder at him; for that his fight is not here against Papists and their church, but against St. Augustine and his; which sometimes themselves will say to have been the true Catholic Church, and that Protestants are true members thereof.

Mr. Rogers's
works faulty
in the general
heads.

23. Well then, finding the whole work of Mr. Rogers to be faulty in the two general points before mentioned; the one, that he setteth down these Thirty-nine Articles as conformably defended by all Protestant churches, wherein notwithstanding there is infinite disagreement; the other, that he never lightly allegeth truly and sincerely the opinions of Catholics wherein they do dissent from him and his church; by this, I say, I lost all desire of proceeding any further in confronting places together, for that I saw it would grow to a huge volume. And therefore, perceiving that he agreed with the rest in the spirit of unsincere dealing, I made resolution to end with this, as being sufficient to give me a full taste of what I was like to find hereafter. And so I thought good to pass to the third part of this Search, to see whether I could find the like dealing in Catholic writers or no. And for better helping myself therein, I thought it more easy and facile to make this trial substantially by

* Lib. 1 cont. duas Epistolas Pelagian. c. 13.

† Aug. l. 1 De Nupt. et Concupis. c. 23.

the help of those collections which Protestant writers had gathered against Papists concerning their untruths, which if I could see well verified by the collectors, it seemed to me that it would be a strong argument to induce me to think that neither part dealt sincerely. Wherefore unto this Search I applied myself with great attention, and shall desire the reader to yield me the like in reading it over. And I doubt not but that he will receive great light and impression thereby.

THE END OF THE SECOND PART.

THE THIRD PART OF THIS TREATISE, CONTAINING MY
SEARCH INTO CATHOLIC WRITERS AND WRITINGS, WITH
MY FINAL RESOLUTION.

CHAPTER I.

How, after this trial of Protestant books, I resorted unto the writings of the other side, to see whether the like sleights were used also by them, and what I found therein. And, first, what Mr. Jewell objecteth for falsities against Dr. Harding, and how they are answered.

HAVING seen now what hath been rehearsed of the unsincere dealing of so many chief Protestant writers, which I could in nowise excuse, I resolved with myself to try, in like manner, the other side, whether the same proceeding might be found among them; for I had both heard and read Protestants object great multitudes of lies unto the Catholics; and, namely, Mr. Jewell himself to Dr. Harding, saying thus unto him in a certain place of his "Reply," when he had scored up in his margin forty-four untruths against him: *Oh, Mr. Harding* (saith he), *is it not possible that your doctrine may stand without lies? So many untruths in so little room, without the shame of the world, without the fear of God?** And again, in his "Epistle to the Reader:" *This man* (saith he) *could never utter so many untruths together without some special privilege.* And yet further: *Your untruths be so notorious, and so many, as it pitieth me in your behalf to remember them, &c.* Which I having read, there came to my mind the saying of Sallust, *That he which objecteth a*

* Jewell's Reply, p. 91.

crime to another, ought to be very free from the same himself. Which, how could it be true in Mr. Jewell, in respect of those things which before have been set down, I saw not; but yet I determined to go forward to make this trial and examen with all patience, longanimity, and indifferency that I could, and consider what untruths Mr. Jewell did object against Mr. Harding, which were to the number of a hundred and twenty-five in the one-half only of his "Reply," about the first four articles of his "Challenge." For better performance whereof I renewed again my purpose of this severity in judgment as to censure, or admit nothing for untruths that hath not the foresaid two conditions of a proper and formal lie. The first, that the thing be truly objected; and, secondly, that it be such as in the mind of the speaker or writer himself it must needs be false; which is what we call a formal, or wilful lie, according to the saying of St. Augustine, before mentioned, *Lingua ream non facit, nisi mens rea**—"Nothing maketh truly the tongue a liar, or guilty of a lie, but a lying mind that knoweth itself to lie."

2. Now then, whereas I found Mr. Jewell, after a new fashion never heard of before, to score up in the margin of his "Reply" (which was the first combat between him and his adversary) great multitudes of lies, I did greatly marvel at the beginning whether they were such lies indeed as now we have described; and then afterward falling upon the forenamed book of Dr. Stapleton, entitled, "A Return of Untruths," which avowed, first, that of all the one hundred and twenty-five untruths objected by Mr. Jewell, no one of them could be proved to be truly a lie, or an essential untruth indeed; and that, further, he bound himself to prove that Mr. Jewell had committed in the said one-half of his book five hundred and ninety-two inexcusable untruths, according to the conditions before set down, I stood amazed thereat, and began to read the book with great attention; pondering every thing as I went with all diligence possible; and in truth I did not

The offer of Dr.
Stapleton
against Mr.
Jewell's lies.

* Aug. lib. De Mendacio, cap. 9.

find many of those that were objected by Mr. Jewell sufficiently proved to be lies in my opinion; nor scarce any returned by Dr. Stapleton upon him for lies, which I could well avoid or excuse not to be such, and this increased more my wonder and marvel. And for that it is impossible in this little narration of mine to set down all the trial of this matter, which is handled very effectually, as to me it seemeth, in the said large book of Dr. Stapleton, and two large rejoinders of Dr. Harding unto the first four articles of Mr. Jewell's "Challenge," I remit the reader to the perusal of those books, as my Lord of Canterbury remitted me; and I dare assure him he shall find matter enough to make him wonder, and stagger also, if he be a lover of truth, without obstinate partiality.

What kind of things Mr. Jewell scoreth up for lies in his adversary.

3. And yet, somewhat to shew the manner of proceeding in the foresaid book of Dr. Stapleton's "Return," and of Mr. Jewell's dealing against Dr. Harding in scoring up untruths in his margin against him, it shall be well to note that the said Dr. Stapleton doth complain much of Mr. Jewell's sleights in his behalf, as endeavouring by all means, though never so impertinently, to make up a great number of untruths, or *show* thereof in his margin, not that himself thought them to be such, but to deceive his reader (saith he) with the names and numbers of a great rank of untruths. As among others, where he objecteth for lies and untruths the common assertions of Catholic doctrine, which himself doth not believe, as in the first article, leaf 1, 6, 7, 8, 11, 20, 32, touching the name of *mass*, calling it a lie; the like he calleth a lie the doctrine of transubstantiation, art. 2, leaf 41. The doctrine also of the Pope's supremacy he calleth an untruth, as may be seen, *articulo* 4, folio 1; but these things, be they true or false, cannot be called lies, according to the true nature of a lie, which requireth that the utterer thereof do know it, or think it to be a lie; for that otherwise, if the mind be not guilty, as before hath been shewed out of St. Augustine, the tongue cannot be guilty. But when Dr. Harding uttereth any proposition of his religion and belief, it

cannot be imagined, probably, that he thinketh that to be false which he uttereth and believeth ; and, consequently, it can be no lie in him.

4. Another sleight to increase the number ^{a second sleight} of lies objected against his adversary is used ^{in objecting lies.} by Mr. Jewell in many places of his book, which Dr. Stapleton citeth ; and the sleight is to dissemble the purpose and drift of his adversary, and to suppose and give out that his adversary intendeth to prove that which he doth not indeed ; and then upon every proof alleged by his said adversary for his assertion to score up an untruth, for that it is impertinent to the end feigned by Mr. Jewell, whereof I gave* this example before, that in the first article, Dr. Harding intending (before he came to prove *private mass*, wherein none but the priest receiveth) to prove mass and external sacrifice in general, and that it hath been universally received in the Christian Church throughout every age from the beginning ; for this (I say) he allegeth divers ancient fathers, as namely, St. Clement, St. Dionyse, St. Justin, and St. Irenæus, all martyrs ; St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Cyril, confessors and holy bishops ; Mr. Jewell upon each of these scoreth up an untruth, for that (saith he) they speak of *communion*, not of *private mass*, whereas they were not alleged by Dr. Harding to prove *private mass* (without communion of others), but to prove mass and sacrifice in general, he having intention and meaning after to come to the question of *private mass* in particular. And of this fraud you may read in the " Return " of Dr. Stapleton, art. 1, folios 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, &c.

5. The third sleight is, when Mr. Jewell scoreth up for untruths against Mr. Harding not only his own sayings, but the words and sayings of the ancient fathers and doctors alleged by him, as art. 1, folios 10, 26, 29 ; and art. 3, folio 120 ; and art. 4, folio 48, the words of St. Jerome, St. Augustine, of Leontius, of Origen, and of the Council of Nice, are objected for Mr. Harding's untruths, and so likewise the doctrine of St. Hilary, and the words and sayings

* Supra, p. 214.

of Pope Innocentius I. are reckoned by him for untruths, art. 2, folio 48 ; and art. 4, folio 70.

The fourth shift to make a show of many untruths gathered.
6. The fourth shift and singular device objected by Dr. Stapleton to Mr. Jewell is, that to make a greater number of untruths he repeateth one thing oftentimes, thereby to make the number grow, and in one article he repeateth one thing four times. As, for example, he objecteth the doctrine of *daily sacrifice* in the church for an untruth, in the fifth, thirty-third, thirty-fourth, and forty-fourth untruths objected by him ; whereas, being a doctrine of the Catholic Church, it cannot be accounted such an untruth as here we treat of, to wit, wherein the speaker uttereth a thing contrary to his own judgment, as before hath been said ; nor can it be justly ascribed for a lie to Dr. Harding, more than to all others of his religion throughout the world. Many other examples may be given, but these are sufficient, as general heads, to shew the difference between the untruths alleged before out of the Protestant books by the Catholics (where the utterer must needs know that he spake false, and, consequently, were essential and formal lies indeed, as the objectors say) and these other objected by Protestants against Catholics, which are nothing of that nature, though they were truly objected indeed.

7. But I think it not amiss to examine some of Mr. Jewell's examples, as they lie in order in Mr. Stapleton's "Return of Untruths," to the end the reader may consider what substance there is in them. First, About private mass. then, about the first article in controversy betwixt Mr. Jewell and Dr. Harding, concerning *private mass*, or single communion of the priest alone, Dr. Harding, holding that all *masses* are public in that sense, and none so private in respect of communion, but that any man may communicate, that is disposed, at any mass, writeth thus : * *The communion likewise of the sacrament is a public feast of Christ, through the ministry of the priest prepared for every faithful person.* Mr. Jewell answereth thus : *The first untruth ; for there is no such preparation.* Doctor

* See in the Return of Untruths, art. 1, fol. 1.

Harding goeth forward, saying, *And so being common by order of the first institution, and by will of the ministers thereof, it ought to be reputed common and not private.*

Mr. Jewell: *The second untruth: there appeareth no such will in the minister.* Harding: *Therefore, in this respect we do not acknowledge any private mass, but do leave that term to Luther's school,*

Rash scoring
up of untruths.

where it was first devised. Jewell: *The third untruth.*

Harding: *The unbloody and daily sacrifice of the church, commonly called the mass.* Jewell: *The fourth untruth: the old fathers never commonly called it so.*

8. These are the first four untruths objected by Mr. Jewell against Mr. Harding, and returned upon him by Dr. Stapleton, in the very first leaf of his book, whereof we shall a little consider in this place; and as for the first two objected untruths by Mr. Jewell, they seem to have little substance of truth. For if a man do but look upon the said Catholic books in this behalf, or travel through countries of that religion, he shall find by experience of his travel, that in all churches commonly where mass is said there is both sufficient preparation and readiness of will in the priests and other ecclesiastical ministers to communicate any man at any mass, never so private, if they be disposed, and give warning thereof; and that the very reservation of the sacrament for all sudden uses thereof that may occur doth convince the matter manifestly. Forsomuch as the end of this reservation is, that not only in time of the mass itself, but otherwise also, when no mass is, or may conveniently be said, there want not commodity of communion for such as either have need, or desire to participate thereof; so as communion and the facility thereof is much more frequent among Catholics (say they) than among Protestants; yea, the very *canon* of the mass itself, though it be never so private, hath these words: *Supplices te rogamus omnipotens Deus, &c., ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione cælesti et gratia repleamur** — “We do humbly beseech thee, Omnipotent God, that

where-
lawful to com-
municate to
him that will.

* In the canon of mass.

how many soever of us shall receive from the participation of this altar the sacred holy body and blood of thy Son may be replenished with all heavenly blessing and grace."

9. Which words every priest being bound to say daily in every mass, though never so particular and private, as hath been said, declareth manifestly (say they) that there is licence and intention for every man to communicate that will; for that otherwise the *canon* would never say *quot*—"how many soever;" and, consequently, that there is no private mass at all in Mr. Jewell's sense, wherein no man may receive but the priest; which argument, indeed, I was not able in any way to answer, nor do not see, as yet, how it may be answered.

Third objected
untruth by
Mr. Jewell
dissolved.

10. The third objected untruth, which hath no alleged reason by Mr. Jewell, Dr. Stapleton returneth in this manner, that if before the whole school of M. Luther began, it can be shewed that ever any writer did call the mass a *private mass*, in respect that the priest did communicate alone, when there was no other company, he would grant this untruth to be such as he objecteth; but if he cannot, as he avoucheth him never to be able, then, saith he, falleth this untruth upon Mr. Jewell, and not upon Mr. Harding.

11. The fourth objected untruth he returneth also in two sorts: first, that Dr. Harding, in these words, doth not name the old fathers, but spake indefinitely, saying: *the unbloody and daily sacrifice of the Church, commonly called the mass*: so as the word *commonly* includeth also later times, yea, *our times* in like manner, wherein no man can deny but it is generally so called; and the Protestants themselves do confess that it hath been so called for many hundred years upward; so as Mr. Jewell's inference of this fourth untruth, for that *the old fathers never commonly called it so*, though it could be proved, yet doth it not make against Mr. Harding's assertion, and consequently the untruth is returned upon himself. But, secondly, he returneth it more fully thus: the old fathers (saith he) *even within the compass of six hundred years* (whereupon Mr. Jewell so much standeth in his challenge) *did commonly call it so*:

as St. Ambrose,* St. Leo,† St. Gregory.‡ The old fathers also in the Council of Milevi,§ of whom St. Augustine was one; and, in the second of Carthage,|| in Africa; the old fathers, in like manner, of the Councils of Arles,¶ of Orleans,** and Agatho†† in France; the old fathers likewise of the Council of Ilberda,‡‡ and Gerunda§§ in Spain, all within the compass of the first five hundred years after Christ, speaking of that *daily sacrifice*, do call it by the name of *the mass*. Ergo, it is no lie that the old fathers did commonly call the unbloody and daily sacrifice of the church by the name of Mass. And thus are returned these first four untruths; and by these we may judge somewhat of the rest, for that most are of like quality.

12. Furthermore Dr. Stapleton goeth forward to cite more sayings of Dr. Harding, with the objections of untruths by Mr. Jewell against the same. *St. Andrew the apostle* (saith Mr. Harding), *touching the substance of the mass, worshipped God every day with the same service as priests now do in celebrating the external sacrifice of the church.*||| Mr. Jewell thus answereth: *The sixth untruth. St. Andrew said the communion and not the mass.* Mr. Harding saith further: *They shall find* (saith he) *the same most plainly treated of, and a form of mass, much agreeable to that which is used in these days, set forth by St. Dionyse, scholar to St. Paul.*¶¶

* Epist. 33. [20th of the Ben. Ed. tom. iii. 900. Venice, 1751.—He is giving his sister an account of disturbances at Milan. *Sequenti die...post lectiones atque tractatum, dimissis catechumenis, symbolum aliquibus competentibus in baptisteriis tradebam basilicæ. Illic nuntiatum est mihi, &c. Ego tamen mansi in munere, MISSAM facere cœpi. Dum OFFERO, raptum cognovi a populo Castulum quendam, &c. Amarissime flere, et orare in ipsa OBLATIONE Deum cœpi, &c.*]

† Epist. 81, ad Dioscurum. Labbe, iii. 1374. The text has been already given, supra, p. 177.

‡ Gregor. l. 4, Ep. 32. § Can. 12. || Can. 3. ¶ Can. 2. ** Can. 22.

†† Can. 21 et 47. ‡‡ Can. 4. §§ Can. 3.

||| In Vita S. Andr. per Presbyteros Achaicæ. [Θυσίαν ζώσαν ἀναφέρω (I offer the living sacrifice). Gallandus i. 156. The authenticity of these acts of St. Andrew's martyrdom was generally admitted at the time, and not denied by Jewell. More modern writers are divided in opinion on the subject. But what are we to think of Jewell's assertion, "St. Andrew said the communion?"']

¶¶ [In common with all his contemporaries, Harding erroneously ascribed the works of an author of the fifth century to the Areopagite mentioned Acts xvii. 34. Respecting this author, see Butler, Oct. 3, note.]

Mr. Jewell
very fertile in
noting lies
against his
adversary.

Mr. Jewell: *The ninth untruth. It is the very form of the communion, and nothing like the private mass.* Mr. Harding again: *I refer them, instead of many, to the two fathers, Basil and Chrysostom, whose masses be left to posterity in these times.* Mr. Jewell: *The eleventh untruth. They contain the very order of the communion.* Mr. Harding yet further: *Among all other fathers, Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus is not to be passed over lightly, who at large expoundeth the whole mass used in Jerusalem in his time, the same which now we find in old St. Clement long before him* and others.* Mr. Jewell: *The twelfth untruth. It is the very express order of the communion.*

13. These other four objected untruths Mr. Stapleton returneth, as it seemeth, with the same facility that he did the other, affirming first, that, in their sense, the mass and communion are the selfsame thing in substance, the communion being a principal part of the mass, without which there is no sacrifice; for which cause the priest always communicateth either alone or with others, when company doth offer itself, or are prepared for it, and consequently it is a fraud (saith he) of Mr. Jewell to put a contradiction between communion and private mass, as though the one could not stand with the other, saying that the forenamed fathers, which are cited to have said mass, said the communion and no mass, whereas we (saith Mr. Stapleton) hold that they did both, and said the one and the other; to wit, both mass and communion; that is, they celebrated the daily sacrifice and therewithal did communicate.

14. But if Mr. Jewell mean of the English communion, wherein no external sacrifice nor real presence of Christ's body is acknowledged or believed, then proveth Dr. Stapleton that the foresaid fathers cannot possibly be

* [It is doubtful whether "long before" St. Cyril; that is, long before the middle of the fourth century. For without pretending to determine the date of the liturgy alluded to, we may affirm with certainty that the ascribing of it to "old St. Clement" (Bishop of Rome in the first century) is an error. But this does not affect the question here at issue between Harding and Jewell. That question is on the *contents* of the work bearing the name of St. Clement.]

understood to speak of that communion, for that in their said liturgies they do make express mention of the real presence of Christ's flesh therein, and *of the offering up* (as the express words of St. Andrew are) *of the sacred body and blood of Christ our Saviour, in sacrifice unto God his Father.* And, moreover, in St. Dionyse's mass there is express mention of oblation and consecration of the mysteries of prayer for the dead, of altars, censuring, communion, and memory of saints, all which things are not in the English mass or communion. And much more he sheweth the same in the mass or liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, where, after the oblation made of the sacrifice, *Commemoration* (saith he) *is made also of the blessed saints in heaven, and, namely, of our Blessed Lady and St. John Baptist, and of the saint of the day, and of prayer for the dead;* which last clause St. Cyril doth explicate more particularly, saying: *Cum hoc sacrificium offerimus, &c.*—"When we offer up this sacrifice, after (the oblation) we make mention also of those which have departed this life before us." *And, first, of the patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs, that by their prayers and intercessions Almighty God may receive our prayers. And then we pray for the holy fathers and bishops departed; and, lastly, we pray for all men which among us have deceased, believing it to be a great release of souls for whom the intercession of that holy and dreadful sacrifice, which is laid upon the altar, is offered.**

About the sacrifice of the mass.

Prayer to saints and for the dead in mass.

15. These are the words of St. Cyril, whereupon Mr. Stapleton demandeth: *Is this the express order of your communion?* Here you see (saith he) is oblation, sacrifice, altar, prayer to saints, prayer for the dead, and is all this done in your English communion? And, if it be not, how then have you scored up these four lies against Doctor Harding, whereas they are all returned and redoubled against yourself? Thus Dr. Stapleton urgeth Mr. Jewell; and it seemed hard to me to avoid the charge.

* Cyril in Catech. xxiii. 9. [μεγίστην ὀνησιον πιτεύοντες ἔσσεσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡ δέησις ἀναφέρεται τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικτοδυσάτης προκειμένης ΘΥΣΙΑΣ.]

say curiosity
to see the cause
of Mr. Jewell's
outcry.

16. But here now came upon me a certain curiosity to see what was the forenamed forty-fourth untruth, whereupon or by occasion whereof Mr. Jewell did so cry out against Mr. Harding, by way of reprehension, as before you heard, saying, *O Mr. Harding, is it not possible your religion may stand without lies? So many untruths in so little room, without the shame of the world, without fear of God, &c.* I was taken (as I say) with a great desire to peruse that forty-fourth objected untruth, and some other going before to consider what substance, or circumstances of extraordinary enormity they might have in them that deserved so great and general an outcry, persuading myself that without singular cause Mr. Jewell would never have uttered so great and sharp a reprehension. I took, therefore, the view of that forty-fourth and the other three next precedent objected untruths; to wit, the forty-first, forty-second, forty-third, and forty-fourth.

17. The forty-first and forty-second untruths are objected by reason of a place of St. Chrysostom, twice found in the same father, as Mr. Harding saith,* wherein is proved that private mass was used in St. Chrysostom's time, forsomuch as reprehending the people for their great slackness in preparing themselves to receive but very seldom in the year, he useth these words: *The daily sacrifice is offered in vain; we stand at the altar for nought; there is not one that will be houseled.* Out of which words Mr. Jewell objecteth two untruths, saying, first: *The one-and-fortieth untruth: private mass is never found in Chrysostom;*† and then again, *The forty-second untruth: there came many both of the people and also of the clergy* (to communicate with him). Both which untruths Dr. Stapleton returneth briefly and effectually, as it seemeth to me, upon Mr. Jewell, out of the very same words of St. Chrysostom. For to the first he saith:

18. *Private mass is nothing else, according to Mr. Jewell, but when the priest doth celebrate and offer sacrifice without any to communicate with him; but here St. Chrysostom saith expressly, that both he and other priests did offer daily*

* Hard. div. 34, fol. 268.

† Jewell's Reply, p. 8.

sacrifice without other communicants (but only themselves); ergo, *they said private mass*. The other also he proveth by the same words of St. Chrysostom: *nullus est qui communicetur**—"there is not one that will be houseled;" ergo, according to St. Chrysostom, it must needs be false which Mr. Jewell saith, *that there came many both of the people and of the clergy to be houseled with St. Chrysostom*. So as these two lies do seem to be very small or none at all on Dr. Harding's part, but scarce unavoidable in the behalf of Mr. Jewell, if St. Chrysostom may be heard and accredited in his own cause.

19. The forty-third untruth is objected upon certain words of Dr. Harding, where he saith, *that in the great and populous city of Antioch, where the Scriptures were daily expounded and preached, &c.* Whereunto Mr. Jewell replieth, with objecting a lie in these words: *The forty-third untruth: there was no such daily preaching, as shall appear*: and then for proof he allegeth a place out of St. Chrysostom, that preaching of public sermons in Antioch was commonly but once a week, which Dr. Stapleton sheweth to be sufficient to prove that it might thereby be called *daily*, as Mr. Jewell himself doth grant the sacrament to be *panem nostrum quotidianum*†—"our daily bread," and yet not ministered precisely every day, though it may be given every day, when men offer themselves to receive; and daily sacrifice is called *daily*, for that it may be every day celebrated, though every priest is not bound daily to celebrate the same. So as this seemed to me to be but a cavil.

20. The last untruth then of these four, whereat Mr. Jewell doth before so exceedingly exclaim, is grounded upon these words of Dr. Harding: *The sacrifice which Christ commanded to be done in his remembrance, &c.* The fourth untruth (saith Mr. Jewell); *for Christ commanded no such daily sacrifice*.‡ Whereunto Dr. Stapleton replieth, first, that in Dr. Harding's words is not found *daily*, but that Christ commanded sacrifice to be done, which Mr.

* Chrys. Hom. 61 ad Populum Antiochenum. [Hom. 3, in Epist. ad Ephes. Saville's Edit. iii. 778.]

† Jewell, pp. 62, 63.

‡ Return, fol. 32, 33.

Jewell hath noted for three several lies before ; to wit, the fifth, thirty-third, and thirty-fourth untruths ; and now he repeateth the same the fourth time to make up his number, and after crieth out, as you have heard: *O Mr. Harding, is it not possible, &c.* But for return of this untruth, being grounded upon the denial of a received doctrine among the Catholics, about daily sacrifice, Dr. Stapleton allegeth many proofs out of the ancient fathers, as presently will appear. And first, for answering the ordinary objection out of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Christ offered one sacrifice and oblation once for all, and that this doth not derogate from the daily sacrifice offered by priests, he allegeth St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Primasius, Eusebius Emissenus, St. Augustine, Oecumenius, in their Commentaries upon that Epistle, who teach the same.* And as for the *daily* external sacrifice of the altar (as commonly it is called), he bringeth a whole multitude of the ancient fathers affirming the same and testifying the practice of all priests, and of the universal church, in offering daily the said external sacrifice in their days, as of St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, Eusebius, Augustine, Innocentius, Basil ; ancient decrees of councils and ecclesiastical histories, whereof some were examined by myself, and I remit the reader to see them further in the places there quoted by Dr. Stapleton, in his said "Return of Untruths," upon the thirty-third objected untruth by Mr. Jewell. So as these untruths being so sleight and so slenderly proved by Mr. Jewell, and returned so strongly by Dr. Stapleton, made me conceive that this manner of gathering untruths of Mr. Jewell's behalf was rather an ambitious ostentation of diligent collection and observation against his adversary, than any substantial laying together of important matter.

21. Well, then, Mr. Jewell having, in the one-half of his "Reply" (as hath been said), objected an hundred and five-and-twenty untruths to Mr. Harding, and Doctor Stapleton reproving the same, and returning them all as

* Chrys. Hom. 17, in Ep. ad Hebr. ; Theodoret in cap. 6 ad Hebr. ; Primasius in cap. 10 ad Hebr. ; Euseb. Emiss. Hom. 5, de Paschate ; August. Ep. 23 ad Bonif. et l. 10, de Civit. Dei, c. 6 ; Oecumen. in c. 5 ad Heb. ; Return, art. 1, pp. 21, 22, 23, 24.

false and calumnious, except only two, which out of some error had some probability in them; I, examining the same, found, as here you have seen, that these were not such untruths as we properly here talk of, that are wilful and malicious, which are truly lies indeed; but rather contentious things objected without sufficient proof, as to me it seemed, and, consequently, either little or nothing to the purpose, or wholly against Mr. Jewell himself. And for the two which are confessed to have some probability, they are the one hundred and third and one hundred and twenty-fourth, in the latter whereof, *Caput omnium* is alleged by Mr. Harding, out of St. Augustine, for *Caput eorum*, by error of print perhaps, but yet so as both may stand in true sense, as is shewed by Dr. Stapleton out of the text itself. The other, where the words of St. Jerome,* *Ecclesie salus à summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet*, are referred by Doctor Harding to the Bishop of Rome, which, in a true sense and application of St. Jerome's words, is true, though the thing be spoken by him immediately of every bishop or high priest within his diocese. This plain dealing, then, and confession of error and oversight, where it was, I found on Dr. Harding and Dr. Stapleton's part, and it contented me much, perceiving thereby that they had not any intention to deceive.

The plain dealing I found in Catholics, confessing an oversight where any was.

22. But, on the contrary side, the said Dr. Stapleton, besides the returning of these hundred and twenty-five upon Mr. Jewell himself, chargeth him with four hundred and thirty-seven other several untruths, committed by him in charging Dr. Harding with the foresaid one hundred and twenty-five.† So as in all they be five hundred and sixty-two, which are laid to Mr. Jewell's charge; and the last of all is founded in those words of Mr. Jewell: "Albeit (*saieth he*) Mr. Harding hath travailed painfully, both by himself and with conference with his friends; yet cannot he hitherto find, neither in the Scriptures, nor in the old councils, nor in any one of all the ancient Catholic fathers, that the Bishop of Rome, within the space of the first six hundred

Mr. Jewell charged with the hundred and sixty-two untruths.

* Hier. contra Luciferianos.

† Return of Untruths, p. 96.

years, was ever entitled either the universal bishop, or the head of the universal church." * So he. And this doth Dr. Stapleton call a desperate untruth, forsomuch as he knew and himself confessed † before, that Pope Leo was called "Universal Bishop," in four sundry supplications in the general Council of Calcedon; and that Eugenius, Archbishop of Carthage, called the Church of Rome head of all churches, as Victor Uticensis testifieth in his book "De Persecutione Vandalica." ‡ He addeth also a testimony of St. Gregory, of Justinian, of Prosper, of Athanasius, to the same effect. § And how then (saith Dr. Stapleton) can he affirm that no one council or ancient Catholic father doth testify the same? Which authorities I finding to be so as is rehearsed, and presuming Mr.

The difference
of falsities ob-
jected on both
sides.

Jewell, that knew so much more than I, to have known also this to have been so, this seemed to me indeed to be a lie in its proper nature, and substantial circumstance; and so are commonly all those that I saw objected by that side against Mr. Jewell; which, being compared with the weakness of those that are objected by the contrary part, seemed to me a most clear difference between both parties, especially when I had considered the untruths which Mr. Jewell had noted against Dr. Harding, in his "Defence of the Apology," which was the second part of his combat, which were indeed such trifles, as did not seem worthy to be named, being errors or oversights of print for the most part; as that he cited "Josue" for "Osee," and "lib. 8," of Socrates, whereas he wrote but seven books; "Luke ii." for "xxii." "Henry the Second" for "Henry the son," and such other small trifles.

23. And the greatest of all in his whole catalogue is, that in reciting the words of St. Augustine, *Christus ferebatur in manibus suis* ||—"Christ was borne in his own hands,"

* Jewell, p. 314.

† Page 228.

‡ [In the year 483, the Arian king, Huneric, summoned the Catholics to a conference. Eugenius, in his answer to the summons, says: "Scribam ego fratribus meis, ut veniant coepiscopi mei, qui nobiscum fidem communem nostram valeant demonstrare, et præcipue Ecclesia Romana, quæ caput est omnium ecclesiarum."—Victor, lib. ii. p. 38.]

§ Return, fol. 196.

|| Aug. in Psalm xxxiii. Sermo i.

Mr. Harding is accused to have left out the word *quodammodo*—"after a sort;" whereupon Mr. Jewell insulteth much, as though it had been done of fraud: but the other quitteth himself in my opinion very substantially, shewing that St. Augustine, in that sermon upon the Psalm xxxiii.,* which he allegeth, where he talketh of the real presence, hath not *quodammodo*, albeit, in *another* place, speaking of the different manner of bearing himself in his own hands from our sensible conceit, he saith, *ipse se quodammodo portabat*—"he, in a certain sort, did bear himself." So as this, which was objected for the greatest untruth, being no untruth indeed, confirmed me much in this opinion, that rather shows of untruths than untruths indeed, in that nature of untruths and witting false dealing which I required, were objected by Mr. Jewell. And so much for him: about whom I have been more large and ample, both in considering the falsities and falsehoods objected by other men against him, and how he cleared himself; as also the fal-

* [Tom. iv. 160. Ed. 1700. In reference to an obscure phrase in the old Latin version of 1 Kings (Sam.) xxi. 13, which phrase seems also to have been repeated in the Title to Psalm xxxiii., St. Augustine says: *Quomodo intelligatur in ipso David secundum literam non invenimus, in Christo autem invenimus. Ferebatur enim Christus in manibus suis quando commendans ipsum corpus suum ait, Hoc est corpus meum. Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis. Ipsa est humilitas Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Ipsa multum commendatur hominibus, &c.*—If, as Jewell, Aubertin, and others, have objected, St. Augustine says elsewhere, in reference to the same subject: *Ipse se portabat quodammodo, cum diceret, Hoc est corpus meum*, it may be satisfactorily replied, that the term *quodammodo* does not necessarily imply an extenuation of what is asserted, but is occasionally a specification of it. St. Augustine will furnish us with exemplifications of this. In his admirable letter to Volusianus, the object of which is to explain the divine incarnation, he describes the word as united with man *quodammodo*.—Ep. 137, tom. ii. 308. In a letter to St. Jerome, he observes that the human soul is immortal *secundum quendam modum*.—Ep. 146, tom. ii. 444. Unquestionably, St. Augustine believed the soul to be *really* immortal, and the union of the word with our nature to be a *real* union. Therefore, the term *quodammodo* cannot, in the present case, be held to negative a foregoing most distinct assertion of the real corporeal presence in the Eucharist, and of the "*literal*" fulfilment (by Christ) of the words, *Et ferebatur in manibus suis*. But it will be best to exhibit the whole of the passage to which Jewell appeals. (It occurs in the *second* Sermon on Psalm xxxiii. The passage to which Harding referred has just been quoted from the *first* Sermon.) *Quomodo ferebatur in manibus suis? Quia cum commendaret ipsum corpus suum et sanguinem suum, acceperit in manus suas quod norunt fideles, et ipse se portabat, quodammodo, cum diceret, Hoc est corpus meum.*—p. 161.]

sities he objecteth to his adversaries, and how he could prove them. This, I say, I have done more abundantly with him than with any other, for the causes before rehearsed, namely, that he being the chief man of our nation that set forth and propugned the new religion, which now we hold in England, and in whom for that respect I had most confidence for sundry years of all other men, I thought good to look most of all into his works and writings, and manner of proceeding, for satisfying myself about this point of false or true dealing. And so much the rather, for that I assured myself, that by him I might make a great guess of all ensuing writers after him, concerning their fidelity; having observed, that most of them, if not all, have gleaned out of him what they have set forth in matter of controversy. [And I am sufficiently persuaded that the spirit of lying proper to false prophets, hath and doth dwell, and inhabit in the hearts of all such as are, or have been, principal posts or pillars of Protestant doctrine, and hereof thyself mayest judge, good Christian reader, by those few, of many, taxed and convinced of that detestable and soul-killing crime in this Search.]

24. But now next after Mr. Jewell we shall examine some others, in like manner, that make profession of objecting untruths against the said Roman writers, in which kind I find Mr. Sutcliffe to be the most copious in all his writings; which albeit they seem to be of less esteem among the learned than many other of his side, in regard both of his insufficient handling of matters, and excessive foul speech in railing; yet for that he saith and objecteth much, and that against the principal of the other side, and seemeth to have a purpose to imitate Mr. Jewell in this behalf, I think good to take a view of some of his objections, to see whether he proceed any more substantially and sincerely than hitherto I had found in Mr. Jewell; and whether I might espy that wilful manner of lying among the Catholics which hitherto we have treated of.

CHAPTER II.

What Imputation of Lies and Untruths hath been made by others against Writers of the Roman Religion; and principally by Mr. Dr. Sutcliffe, in sundry books of his written these years past; and first against Cardinal Bellarmine. And of what force they are proved to be.

ALBEIT by my former search in Mr. Jewell's books, and others that answered them, I found the small satisfaction that you have heard, or rather greater increase of my scruples and perplexities; yet I resolved to pass forward in the said search and inquiry. And, amongst all other Protestant writers, perceiving Mr. Sutcliffe, as hath been so said, to have practised most this manner of objecting lies, falsities, and corruptions to his adversaries the Papists, yea, and to make whole catalogues and chapters thereof in all his books, I presumed that in him I should find store of matter more substantial than in Mr. Jewell, especially for that I saw him offer combat therein to all sorts of men whatsoever, as, namely, to Cardinal Bellarmine, Cardinal Baronius, Father Persons, and others. And against Bellarmine he entereth with this preface, which I take to be common to all: *That he would be loath to wrong any man, especially in writing, where all that read may be witnesses of the wrong.** Whereof I inferred that all the lies objected by him should be certain and substantial; but yet, when presently after I heard him avouch solemnly, that *Bellarmino's great volumes of "Controversies" were but as the stables of Augæas, containing an infinite heap of dung, and that for his part he testified before God, that they have much confirmed him in the truth, and that they are much more tedious for him to read than hard*

* Sutcliffe, in his Challenge, p. 135.

to refute,* I began to doubt how far I might trust him, that maketh such a testification before God, as every man that heareth and knoweth him must needs think it to be a mere vaunt and a lie against his own conscience; for that no Protestant, I think, besides himself doth esteem either so basely of Bellarmine's writings, or so highly of Mr. Sutcliffe's ability in answering, as himself seemeth to insinuate in these his words. Wherefore, letting this pass, I went (to confess the truth), with no little prejudice of his fidelity, to examine the lies objected by him in two several chapters of his said book against Cardinal Bellarmine. And so much the more, for that I had seen many gross and wilful lies of his noted and set down before, as the reader hath perused in the precedent chapters; but yet, for that not so much the credit of the objector, as the proofs he bringeth, are to be weighed in this combat, I determined with myself to have patience to examine some particulars, though not all, for that they are very many, and by a few a man may know his talent, according to the proverb, *ex ungue leonem*.

2. The first lie and falsification objected to Cardinal Bellarmine is thus set down in Mr. Sutcliffe's words: "First (saith he) Bellarmine doth wilfully corrupt the sixth canon of the Council of Nice, which beginneth thus: *Mos antiquus perduret in Egypto, &c.*" But Bellarmine maketh the canon to begin far otherwise, saying:† *Observandum in libris vulgatis deesse initium hujus canonis, quod tale est: Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*, but the last words are plainly forged, &c."‡ So he. But the point is (if they may be proved to be forged), who is to be charged with this forgery? for truly, when I came to read Bellarmine's words, and to compare them with this charge of *forgery and wilful corruption* by Mr. Sutcliffe, my face became crimson indeed, as he said that Bellarmine's should, by these lies objected against him. And indeed I blushed on Mr. Sutcliffe's behalf, to find him to utter so wilful an untruth himself in the very first beginning, and so mani-

* Sutcliffe, in the Defence of his Challenge, anno 1602, cap. 6, p. 135.

† Bellar. l. 2, De Pontif. Rom. c. 13.

‡ Sutcliffe, p. 136.

festly to calumniate Bellarmine in this charge, and that in such sort, as all his readers may see and be witnesses of the wrong indeed. For that Cardinal Bellarmine, alleging the said sixth canon of the first Nicene Council, saith that the beginning of the canon, as now it standeth in the tome of the printed councils, is in these words, *Mos antiquus perduret in Egypto, &c.*—"Let the ancient custom be kept in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction of all those places, forsomuch as the like custom is observed by the Bishop of Rome."

About corrupting the canons of the Council of Nice.

3. And hitherto he agreeth with Mr. Sutcliffe: but then he further adjoineth the *Observandum* before mentioned. "It is to be noted (saith Bellarmine),* that in the ordinary books of the councils now extant, there wanteth the beginning of this sixth canon, which is this: *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum, mos autem perduret, &c.*—"The Roman Church hath ever (in jurisdiction) had the primacy; but let the custom continue that is in Egypt, Libya, Pentapolis, &c.'" And for proof of this ancient beginning of the said canon, he allegeth first the testimony of an old famous learned man, named Dionysius Abbas,† who so translated the same out of Greek above a thousand years gone; and consequently at that time the canon began so. And then, for more than two hundred years before that again, the said canon was so cited by Paschasius, bishop and legate of Pope Leo I. in the General Council of Chalcedon;‡ and so was it admitted, with uniform consent,§ by all that council in the sixteenth Action. Whereupon the judges in that council concluded in these words: *Pertendimus omnem primatum et honorem præcipuum, &c.*—"We have considered that all primacy and chief honour is reserved by the canons unto old Rome, and to the archbishop thereof, most beloved of God."|| This is all that Bellarmine saith of this matter; wherein I find no cause at all of ob-

* Bellar. ubi supra.

† Dionysius Abbas citatus ab Alano Copo, Dialog. 1.

‡ Conc. Chalced. Act. 16.

§ [It would be more correct to say, with Cardinal Orsi, "that it was not contested."—*Istoria Ecclesiastica*, xiv. 328.]

|| Conc. Chalced. Act. 16.

jecting wilful corruption unto him, or any least corruption at all, who relateth only what other men write of the thing. And surely, to see Mr. Sutcliffe begin his very first onset of accusing Bellarmine with so manifest fraud on his own side, concealing that which he could not but see and know, made me much to despair of any good success from him in this trial; yet thought I best to go forward therein, as also I did.

4. His second charge is in these words:
Second charge. “Bellarmine (saith he), in his book *de Pontifice*, falsifieth Jerome’s words, and perverteth his meaning, to prove that he called Pope Damasus the foundation of the church; whereas he meant of Christ only,” &c.* But here I found no less injustice on Mr. Sutcliffe’s behalf than in giving the former charge; for that Bellarmine, in the place cited by Mr. Sutcliffe, treating of the eminent names given by ancient fathers to the Bishop of Rome above other bishops, saith: *Octavum est, Fundamentum, &c.*†—“The eighth name is the name of *foundation*,” used by St. Jerome to Pope Damasus, when he wrote in his epistle unto him, *Super hanc petram ædificatam ecclesiam scio*—“Upon this rock or foundation I know the church to be builded.” Whereupon Bellarmine inferreth, *Ubi Damasum ecclesiæ petram vocat*—“in which words St. Jerome calleth Damasus *the rock or foundation of the church*.” Nor hath Bellarmine any thing more in that place, but only these three lines. Let us see, then, how Bellarmine may justly be accused of falsifying of St. Jerome’s words, and perverting his meaning by writing as you have heard Mr. Sutcliffe affirm.

5. The best way of trial shall be by laying forth St. Jerome’s own words, who, living, as he saith, in the east parts of the world, about Antioch, and seeing the whole church to be divided and in strife about certain relics of the Arian heresy, whether the word *hypostasis* should be granted or no, he thought it best to write, for resolution of that doubt, unto Pope Damasus, shewing the eminency of that church above others. And in the end of the same epistle, entreating him to signify with whom he would have him communicate at Antioch—*cui apud Antiochiam debeam*

* Sutcliffe, p. 136.

† Lib. 2, De Pontif. c. 31.

communicare, significes; and adding divers reasons why he, though living so far off, did make recourse to Damasus above all others, said, among other reasons, *Apud vos solos incorrupta patrum servatur hæreditas*—"With you only is the inheritance of our ancestors kept entire from corruption." And again: *Vos estis lux mundi, vos sal terræ, vos aurea vasa et argentea*—"You are the light of the world, you are the salt of the earth, you are the golden and silver vessels." *A pastore præsidium ovis flagito*—"I, being a sheep, do demand help (in these doubts about faith) from you that are the shepherd." And then immediately follow the words which Mr. Sutcliffe saith are falsified and perverted by Bellarmine: *Ego nullum primum nisi Christum sequens, beatitudini tuæ, id est cathedræ Petri, communione consocior: super illam petram ædificatam ecclesiam scio; quicumque extra hanc domum agnum comederit profanus est**—"I, following none as chief but Christ (who gave you this authority), am joined in communion with your beatitude, that is to say, with the chair of Peter: upon that rock do I know the church to be built; whosoever shall eat the lamb out of this house is profane."

6. These are St. Jerome's words: upon which Bellarmine did infer, that St. Jerome did call Damasus, and St. Peter's chair wherein he sat as bishop, *the rock of the church*. Mr. Sutcliffe accuseth him for falsification of the words, and perverting the sentence of St. Jerome; for that he will have *super illam petram* to signify Christ, and not *your beatitude*, and *the chair of Peter*, which seemeth to me a violent and plain enforced exposition, and confuted by the very purpose of St. Jerome's whole discourse, and by those last words—*quicumque extra hanc domum*; so that *hanc* and *illam* must needs be referred to the same; and by *hanc domum* cannot be meant Christ. Besides that, I did find, by perusing St. Jerome, that it is no infrequent phrase with him to call St. Peter and his chair, and successor therein, *the rock* or *foundation* whereon the church by Christ was builded; for that in one place he saith, *Ut Plato princeps philosophorum, sic Petrus apostolorum fuit, super quem ecclesia Domini stabili mole fundata est†*—

* Hieron. Epist. 57, ad Damasum.

† Ibid. lib. 1, Dial. ad. Pelag. c. 1.

"As Plato was prince of philosophers, so was Peter of the apostles, upon whom the church of Christ, as upon an immoveable foundation, is founded." And again, in another place: *Si Apostolus Petrus, SUPER QUEM Dominus fundavit ecclesiam, &c.*—"If the Apostle Peter, upon whom Christ did found his church, &c."* And yet further, in another place: *Secundum metaphoram petræ, rectè dicitur ædificabo ecclesiam meam super TE*†—"According to the metaphor of a rock, it was truly said unto St. Peter (by Christ), I will build my church upon thee." So as these manners of speech, being ordinary in St. Jerome to call Peter and his seat, and succession, *the rock* and *foundation of the church*, I do marvel with what colour, countenance, or conscience Mr. Sutcliffe could in print accuse Bellarmine of falsification and corruption in this behalf; concluding thus his accusation: "But Bellarmine (saith he), to prove the Pope to be the foundation of the church, leaveth out Christ, and for the pronoun *illam* writeth *hanc*, like a cunning falsary." Which, how falsely it is objected, appeareth plainly by the text itself; for that the text of St. Jerome hath both *illam* and *hanc*, as we have now seen; and therefore no advantage seemeth to me can arise by using either of these particles, according to St. Jerome's meaning, who useth both; and consequently this is far off from a notorious untruth boldly avouched, as Mr. Sutcliffe termeth it.

7. The third falsification is objected by Mr. Sutcliffe in these words: *In the same book and chapter he falsifieth the acts of the Council of Chalcedon.* And for proof of this falsification Sutcliffe setteth down a certain narration, so obscure and confused, as few readers will understand him; for that he neither Englisheth the Latin nor distinguisheth one thing from another; and this of purpose (as some perhaps will say) not to be well understood. But I shall relate the matter as briefly and clearly as I may. Bellarmine, therefore, treating of the different names of excellency given in old time by ancient fathers and councils to the Bishop of Rome, as hath been said, writeth, *Septimum est, Caput ecclesiæ*‡—"The seventh

* Hieron. Epist. 54, ad Marcellam.

† Id. ad Matt. xvi.

‡ Lib. 2, De Rom. Pontif. c. 31.

name of honour given to the Pope is that he is head of the church;" which name the Council of Chalcedon (above twelve hundred years past) doth use in an epistle to Pope Leo, saying, *Quibus tu velut membris CAPUT præeras*—"Over whom you, as head over the members, do bear rule."* And in the first Action of the said council the Roman Church is called the head of all the churches.

8. These are Bellarmine's words; and he writeth no more of this matter in that place. Now then let us consider what falsification of the acts of this council Bellarmine may be proved to have used. First, of these two authorities alleged by Bellarmine, Mr. Sutcliffe only impugneth the first, letting pass the second, which proveth the same thing. He standeth upon the words *quibus tu velut membris caput præeras*, saying that *this is referred to certain priests of Leo's order, in which rank he shewed himself principal, &c.* So, as he saith, that these words of the council do acknowledge only that Leo was head of certain priests, but not of the bishops gathered together at that council. But when I went and perused the place in the council itself, I did wonder to see so false a charge made by Mr. Sutcliffe; for, first, this epistle of the council is entitled, *Relatio S. Synodi Chalcedonensis ad Beatum Papam Leonem, de omnibus gestis, &c.*†—"A Relation of the holy Council of Chalcedon to Blessed Pope Leo of all things done in the said council, demanding also his approbation." To which "Relation" Pope Leo himself answered in an epistle, which in number is the sixty-first among his epistles, approving all the definitions of faith made therein, though rejecting divers other things; which very act on both sides seemeth to prove some superiority he had over them. But, to come to the words alleged by Bellarmine, *quibus tu velut membris caput præeras*, for that Mr. Sutcliffe saith that they were put down fraudulently, by leaving out the words going before and the words following after, which plainly shew that the authors of that epistle never meant to call Leo head of the church, I shall set down the words as they stand in the "Relation."

9. First, then, they shew in this "Relation" by what

* ["*Didst bear rule,*" or preside; *viz.* in the council by his legates.]

† Tom. ii. *Concil. ed. Venet.* p. 342.

favour of God, and special assistance of his, the council was gathered together, continued; and they made their decrees, using this reason or comparison out of the Gospel: *Si enim ubi sunt duo vel tres congregati in nomine ejus, &c.**—"For if where two or three are gathered together in his name, there he affirmeth himself to be in the midst of them;" how much more peculiar care might he shew about priests (gathered together in this council) who did prefer the notifying of their confession of faith before their country, and laboursome journey, *quibus tu quidem velut membris caput præeras, in his qui tuum tenebant ordinem, benevolentiam præferens*—"over which priests (or bishops assembled in this council) you did preside, as head over the members, by those which held your place (to wit, by your legates), shewing your good-will therein." *Imperatores verò ad ornandum decentissimè præsidebant*—"But the emperors (to wit, Marcian and Pulcheria) did most decently preside, to adorn the said council."

10. This is the true speech and sense of this council; and if the Latin seem somewhat hard, the answer is, that they were Grecians that wrote it in Latin to Pope Leo; but I find nothing at all worthy to be called a falsification in those words alleged by Bellarmine; for I find them in the council as he allegeth them, and to the same end he allegeth them for; and much less do I find any probable foundation of Mr. Sutcliffe's invention, that those words, *quibus tu velut membris caput præeras*, were meant, or could be meant, of his presidency over particular priests of his order, and not over all the bishops of the council, who themselves do profess, in the very same epistle, to be subject unto him. And as for the presidency of the emperors here spoken of, it is evident by the council itself, in the first Action, that their place was *ante cancellos*, on the inside, before the bar of separation, under all the bishops; and that they sat there for more adorning and honouring the council, as is said.

11. His fourth charge upon Bellarmine is *Fourth charge.* given in these words: "Likewise (saith he), reckoning up the names of the bishops of Rome, Bellarmine saith that Eusebius, in his 'Chronicle,' A. D. 44,

* Matt. xviii.

doth give them the title of *pontifex Christianorum*; which is a mere forgery; for not to the bishops of Rome, but to Peter only, is that title given, if it be not thrust into the text. But that which belongeth and is properly given to Peter may not be claimed by every bishop of Rome; for I hope that every one of them will not be called Simon, nor an apostle, nor the chief and first apostle; nor will Clemens Octavus, I hope, write Clemens Octavus, *aliter* Simon Petrus, &c.* This fourth charge, when I had perused both Bellarmine† and his author, Eusebius, made me despair of finding any truth at all in Mr. Sutcliffe's sayings or writings; for that here he could not but see and know that he did wittingly both wrong Bellarmine indeed, and use fraud himself; for that Bellarmine, in reckoning up the names of special honour given by antiquity to the bishops of Rome above other bishops, saith, "The third name is *pontifex Christianorum*—'high priest or bishop of the Christians;'" citing Eusebius for the same, and using no further words about that matter; which, notwithstanding, you have heard Mr. Sutcliffe averreth to be mere forgery. Whereupon I repaired to Eusebius's "Chronicle," translated out of Greek into Latin by St. Jerome, and continued by him unto his time, to wit, from the year of Christ 329, wherein Eusebius ended, unto the year 380, when St. Jerome ceased to write his addition. And in this "Chronicle," upon the year of Christ 44, I found these words written: *Petrus Apostolus, natione Galilæus, Christianorum pontifex primus, &c.*—"Peter the Apostle, a Galilean by nation, the first high priest or bishop of the Christians, who, after he had founded the church of Antioch, went to Rome, where, preaching the Gospel, he remained bishop five-and-twenty years." Which words, considering with myself that they were written and proved by two so ancient authors, I marvelled that Mr. Sutcliffe should object forgery; for that here are the very words alleged by Bellarmine. And more also, for here is the word *PRIMUS pontifex*—"the first high priest of the Christians," which Mr. Sutcliffe concealeth. And it seemed to

* Sutcliffe in his Challenge, part 2, fol. 137.

† Bellar. 1. 2, De Pontif. Rom. c. 31; Euseb. and Jerome, in Chron.

me of such importance, as that it taketh away all his objection about the singularity which he ascribeth to St. Peter alone; as though his successors might not claim the same names given unto him, which is true (say the Catholics), if we respect particular and personal names

How St. Peter was first bishop of Christians, according to Eusebius and St. Jerome.

or privileges, but not if we respect names appertaining to his office and dignity, as he was Bishop of Rome, whereof this was one to be called *pontifex Christianorum*; and to shew that this was not peculiar to him alone, it is said there, by Eusebius, *pontifex PRIMUS Christianorum*—"the first high priest of the Christians;" adjoining afterward all the bishops of Rome that ensued in that rank until Eusebius's time, which were thirty; and Silvester was the one-and-thirtieth, ordained Bishop of Rome (saith Eusebius) upon the year 316, wherein himself then lived. And St. Jerome continueth the same catalogue or succession of bishops unto Damasus, the five-and-thirtieth bishop of Rome.

12. Now then, Eusebius, setting down St. Peter for *primus pontifex*, and Linus for the second, saying, *Post Petrum, primus Romanam Ecclesiam tenuit Linus annos undecim*—"After Peter, Linus was the first that held the Roman Church under his government for eleven years;" it seemeth evident, that as the charge and office went down from Peter to the rest, so the name also of *pontifex Christianorum* must needs pass therewith; and the objection which Mr. Sutcliffe maketh, that he hopeth every pope will not be called Simon, nor Clemens Octavus will be called Simon Petrus, seemeth a very shallow argument. For that these things are particular and personal in Peter, as every man seeth; and it is as if a man should say to a king of England, in these days, descending from King William I., surnamed Conqueror, and Bastard, I hope you will not be called William, nor Conqueror, nor Bastard; *ergo*, you will not challenge the name of King of England, nor of Duke of Normandy, as from him, which yet descended from him, as head and origin of all the kings that have ensued after him in that rank. This, I say, were a very fond and impertinent kind of arguing against

a modern king of England; that, forsomuch as the *personal* names and titles given to King William I. cannot be challenged by his successors, *ergo*, neither the other that appertain to his office and kingly dignity, wherein they succeed him.

13. And thus the discreet reader will see what an endless and fruitless labour it were for me to follow Mr. Sutcliffe in all these sixty-five notorious lies and falsifications which he pretendeth against Bellarmine, having found so little substance or truth in these first four which I have examined in order as they lie, without choice. And for more equal trial, I shall take yet further pains to examine other four of the very last in order; persuading myself that, as Mr. Sutcliffe cannot be but a good orator, so he hath observed the precepts of that art, to place in his first and last ranks *firmissima suæ causæ præsidia*—"the most chief and strongest forces of his cause."

OTHER FOUR CHARGES.

14. The first, then, of these four last charges, *Fifth charge* which is the sixty-second in order, is, that Bellarmine, talking about the honouring of images, and affirming that Protestants, in denying the same, do agree with old heretics, saith: *Xenaias, Persa, primus palàm asseruit Christi et sanctorum imagines non esse venerandas, teste Niceph. lib. 16, cap. 27* *—"Xenaias, a Persian, did first of all openly affirm that the images of Christ and his saints are not to be worshipped, as witnesseth Nicephorus, in his sixteenth book of History, and twenty-seventh chapter." Which allegation of Bellarmine Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth, not only for a lie in itself, but also for a falsification of Nicephorus.† Whereupon I resorted to Nicephorus's "History," where finding him to write many horrible things of this Xenaias, as that he feigned himself to be a priest, yea, and got a bishopric before he was baptized, among other things he writeth this of him:—

* Bellar. l. 4, De Notis Ecclesiae, cap. 9.

† Sutcliffe, Challenge, part 2, fol. 159.

About the first
author of im-
pugning im-
ages.

15. *Xenaias iste primus (O audacem animum et os impudens!) vocem illam evomit, Christi, et eorum qui illi placuere imagines, venerandas non esse* *—"This Xenaias did first of all others (O audacious mind and impudent tongue!) belch out that voice, that the images of Christ, and of those which have been acceptable unto him, are not to be worshipped." So Nicephorus. In which words I found not how either lie or falsification may be justly ascribed to Bellarmine; for that Nicephorus hath all, and more too, than Bellarmine allegeth out of him, as now you have heard. Nay, saith Mr. Sutcliffe, he doth falsify Nicephorus in adding these words: *primus palàm*—"first and openly;" which I wonder at, that ever he would so avouch and put in print, being convinced here by the author himself. For that *primus* (in which word he esteemeth the force of this falsification to consist) is expressly put down, and the other word, *palàm*, is sufficiently expressed by Nicephorus, saying, *that he belched forth that heresy with an audacious and impudent tongue*. Neither doth Bellarmine take upon him to rehearse the precise words of Nicephorus, but only relateth briefly the heresy of Xenaias, described by him as you have heard; and affirmeth no more than is contained in his author, to wit, that Xenaias was the first that publicly was known to impugn the worshipping of images; and this is also affirmed by Functius, a Protestant, who, in his seventh book of Commentaries upon his Chronicle† saith: *Porro, is Xenaias primus in ecclesia bellum contra imagines excitavit*—"Moreover, this Xenaias first raised war in God's church against images." What, then, shall we say to Mr. Sutcliffe's manner of writing, that seemeth to have no care of his credit, much less of his conscience? And if he will go about by other arguments to impugn the doctrine of reverencing images, it is quite from the purpose; for that we talk here of notorious lies and falsifications objected by him to Bellarmine, which yet, hitherto, do fall wholly upon himself, as you see.

The sixth and
seventh charge

16. The next two notorious lies of this rank which he objecteth against Bellarmine, to wit,

* Niceph. l. 16, cap. 27.

† Anno Christi 494.

the sixty-third and sixty-fourth, seem unto me so idle and impertinent things, as they are scarce worth the setting down; but yet I thought good to name them together, that it may be seen how far Mr. Sutcliffe goeth from the point that he should perform, which is, to prove lies, and wilful lies. The first of these two is, that whereas Bellarmine,* amongst other notes of the true church, recounteth one to be *gloria miraculorum* (the glory of miraeles), and sheweth, from time to time, how that glorious note hath been continued in their church from age to age in many holy men, he giveth example, among many others, in these later ages, of St. Bernard, St. Dominic, St. Francis, St. Bernardine of Siena, St. Vincent, St. Antony of Padua, St. Francis of Paula, and some others, to have wrought miracles; all which is objected by Mr. Sutcliffe† as a lie, or rather a multitude of lies, which also, in scoff, he calleth *miraculous lies*; yet here you see, though all were false, which so many writers do testify (in contrary whereof me seemed that Mr. Sutcliffe should have cited some one witness besides himself), yet do I not see how any least formality of lying can truly be objected to Bellarmine; for that no man can imagine that his words do dissent from his meaning, or that he thought it to be false which he out of so many witnesses relateth, which (as we have said) is required to the true substance and formality of a lie.

17. Now, whereas Bellarmine passing on to make comparison between the lives and deaths of these men that are reported to have wrought miracles, and other chief authors and first publishers of Protestant religion, as of Luther, Zuinglius, Ecolampadius, Carolostadius, and Calvin, naming the authors that have written their reproachful lives and deaths, as that Luther died suddenly, being merry and whole when he went to bed; Zuinglius slain in the field; Ecolampadius found dead by his wife in his bed; Carolostadius slain by the devil; and Calvin eaten with worms; all these things Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth as heinous lies to Bellarmine; but these also, supposing they should be false in themselves, and

About the lives
and deaths of
Luther, Zuing-
lius, &c.

* Bellar. De Notis Eccl. l. 4, c. 14, n. 11.

† Sutcl. p. 159.

consequently be material lies, whose nature is such as they may be committed, upon error, without sin, as Augustine holdeth in his book *de Mendacio* :* yet do they want the essence and formality of a true lie, which is, that Bellarmine should think or know them false, which cannot probably be presumed, forsomuch as he allegeth his authors, as well Protestants as Catholics, for the material truth thereof, as Cochläus, in *Vita Lutheri*, and Luther himself, in his Testimonies, † before recited of Zuinglius and Œcolampadius : the ministers of Basle, in their Epistle on the death of Carolostadius ; Jerome Bolsack, on the life and death of Calvin, to whom may be added both Melancthon, *Epist. ad Fred. Miconium*, Kemnitius *de Cæna Domini*, Alberus *contra Carolostadianos*, Joannes Scutz, lib. 50 *Causarum*, cap. 50 ; and many other Protestant writers (especially concerning Carolostadius, his life and death), I find cited by Mr. William Reynolds (a great and studious reader of Protestant writers) in his Treatise of the Sacrament ‡ against Mr. Robert Bruse, minister of Edinburgh ; so as in this point Mr. Sutcliffe seemeth to have said little to the purpose.

The eighth charge.

18. There remaineth then his last charge, which, in order, is the sixty-fifth, and should have been according to reason the greatest, strongest, and most forcible of all the rest, and so have left Bellarmine with a sound knock at his departure. Let us see what it is. “ Bellarmine (saith he) in his second book *de Euchar.* cap. 6, hath these words : *Irenæus probat Christum esse Creatorem, ex eo quòd panis fit corpus Christi per consecrationem* ; but Irenæus hath no such matter ; nay, if he should have used any such argument, then must it follow that Christ's body is created as often as mass is said, &c.” § Whereupon I repaired to Irenæus, and found the quite contrary to that Mr. Sutcliffe avoucheth : for his words are these, dealing against those that denied Christ to be the Son of God, Creator of the world, *Quomodo autem constabit eis (saith he) eum panem in quo gratiæ actæ sunt, corpus esse Domini sui, et calicem sanguinis ejus, si non ip-*

* Aug. l. De Mendacio.

† Pages 40, 41, 42.

‡ Luth. tom. 3, Jena edit. fol. 68.

§ Sutcl. Challenge, part 2, fol. 160.

sum fabricatoris mundi filium dicant, id est verbum ejus per quod lignum fructificat, &c.? — “How can it be clear or made evident to them that the bread in which thanks are given is their body of the Lord, and the cup his blood, if they do not confess that he is the Son of the Creator of the world, that is to say, his word, by which trees do fructify, &c.?”* The force of which argument, in the sense of Irenæus, seemeth plain, as Bellarmine doth propose the same.† For first, St. Irenæus supposing, as a known and confessed principle (saith he), *that the consecrated bread is made the body of Christ, and the cup his blood*: how can this be proved, said Irenæus, except they confess the omnipotency of Christ, and that he is the Son of God the Creator, that is to say, his word, which giveth life to all things? For if he were not the omnipotent Creator, he could not make of bread his body; but *this* was granted by these heretics that denied him to be the Son of the Creator, that bread was made his body; *ergo*, they must needs grant also, that he was Son of the Creator, and of omnipotent power with him, that is to say, he is his *word*, by which all things do fructify.

19. Neither seemeth the objection of Mr. Sutcliffe to be any thing worth (say they) that hereof it would follow that Christ's body should be created so oft as mass is said; for that Catholics do not hold that Christ's body is the mass by new creation, but by transubstantiation only, for that creation *est ex nihilo*, to wit, a production of a thing that was not before, and that of nothing; but Christ's body was in heaven before, and in the mass by consecration (say they) is made present in another place in which he was not before, by the conversion of bread into his body. So as here I did not see what lie could well be objected unto Bellarmine, but rather it appeared that Mr. Sutcliffe did trifle and make vain assaults against him without any effect at all. And, truly, I was forced to esteem the more of Bellarmine a great deal, as of a substantial, learned, and faithful writer, by these so many idle objections made against him by Mr. Sutcliffe, and not proved.

* Iren. l. 4, Cont. Hær.

† Bellar. l. 2, De Euchar. cap. 6.

20. And now, having found so little substance in both *his vanguard*, as also in the *rereward* of his objections,* I imagined how much less I should find in the rest of the corps of his battering army, if I should discuss every particular of the same, which would weary both me and the reader; yet three or four more I will set down. He calleth Bellarmine a *falsary*, for saying,† that St. Chrysostom, in *his Commentary upon those words of Christ* (there are certain eunuchs that geld themselves for the kingdom of heaven; he that can take it, let him take it), *proveth that* The ninth charge. *it is facile et utile abstinere à nuptiis*—"easy and profitable to abstain from marriage"—*whereas the word in St. Chrysostom* (saith Mr. Sutcliffe) *is possible*, possible. But I, going to Chrysostom, found that Bellarmine did not cite the very words of Chrysostom, but only the sum and sense of his discourse, which is full to the effect that Bellarmine declareth, not only for the possibility, but facility also, pleasantness, and reward thereof, *multò faciliùs, tutiùs, atque, jucundiùs* (saith St. Chrysostom) *tum quia spe retributionis corroboraris, tum quia conscientie virtute gaudes*—"Thou mayest live chastely, more easily, safely, and pleasantly (than any eunuch), both for that thou art strengthened with hope of reward, as also thou receivest joy by a virtuous conscience." And how then is Bellarmine called a falsary, for expressing so faithfully and fully the meaning of St. Chrysostom? And, truly, I wondered to see Mr. Sutcliffe seek such poor and weak impugnations.

The tenth charge.

21. As also, in the same place, he impugneth eagerly the true dealing of Bellarmine,‡ in cit-

* Sutcl. p. 139.

† Bellar. lib. 2, De Monach. c. 31. Chrysost. in Comment. in Matt. xix. [...ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῶς κοινώτερον, τῇ τε ἐλπίδι δορυθούμενος, καὶ τῷ συνεῶσι τοῦ κατορθώματος. The Latin and English versions are substantially correct. As to the word "possible," it occurs somewhat earlier in the homily quoted, καὶ τὸ δύνατ' ὅν τῆς ἀρετῆς ταύτης κατασκευάζων, which Walsingham does not deny.—The case then stands as follows: Bellarmine quotes the substance of a passage from St. Chrysostom: Sutcliffe charges him with falsification, and, to prove his charge, quotes a word which he finds about eight lines higher up in the homily. Bellarmine has referred to a word which in no way interferes with the statement.]

‡ Bellar. l. De Notis Ecclesiae, c. 9; Luth. De Captiv. Babyl. cap. de Bapt.

ing Luther's words, who saith: *That a Christian man is so rich, as he cannot perish if he would, quantumcumque malè vivat, how wickedly soever he live*; which last words, Mr. Sutcliffe saith, are corrupted by Bellarmine, for that in Luther's book, of the edition of Wittemberg, it is, *non posset perdere salutem suam quantiscumque peccatis, nisi nolit credere*—"that he cannot lose his salvation by never so great sins, except he will not believe." And now, I would demand, what great difference is there between these speeches alleged by Bellarmine and confessed by Mr. Sutcliffe, especially there being so divers editions of Luther's works, and so differing among themselves, as the "Defence of the Censure"* doth note? And here, in this cause, I find, in effect, no difference at all, for that to say, that a man believing cannot perish, *quantiscumque peccatis, et quantumcumque malè vivat*—"by what great sins soever, and, how wickedly soever he live," seemed to me to be all one in substance. And it seemeth that Mr. Sutcliffe had very little to object, when he objecteth this for a notorious lie, as the title of his chapter importeth.

22. Furthermore, he objecteth that Bellarmine, writing of the heresy of Eunomius, that ^{the eleventh charge.} held only faith to be sufficient to salvation (and thereby meaning for to couple him with Luther), saith his opinion and words were these: *Non posse homini ulla peccata nocere, modò fidem habeat*—"that no kind of sin can hurt a man, so he have faith;" citing St. Augustine† for the same, in his book of "Heresies," that is to say, that this was the heresy of Eunomius; but Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth this for a lie and a forgery in Bellarmine, saying St. Augustine's words to be only, *Quod nihil cuique obesset quorum libet perpetratio ac perseverantia peccatorum, si hujus quæ ab illo docebatur fidei particeps esset*. Eunomius held that the committing of never so many sins, and perseverance in them, could hurt any man if he were a partaker of that faith which by him was taught. And do you see here any difference? Mr. Sutcliffe saith, ‡ *Let indifferent men judge*

* Defence of the Censure, pp. 53, 54.

† August. Hæres. 54.—De Fide et Oper. cap. 14.

‡ Sutcl. p. 149.

whether Eunomius spake absolutely of faith, or of his own peculiar faith. And I would ask Mr. Sutcliffe, whether when the Papists speak of true faith, which they say doth not justify without works, whether they mean not of their own faith? As also when Mr. Luther and Mr. Calvin speak of faith, which alone justifieth without works, whether they speak not of that faith which themselves do hold and teach for the true faith? And if this be so, then doth this charge seem to me to be but a plain cavillation, or rather wilful calumny, in Mr. Sutcliffe, to seek a difference where there is no diversity, neither proving the charge of falsification objected to Bellarmine, nor avoiding the force of his argument, that faith without works was the old heresy of the Eunomians by St. Augustine's judgment.

The twelfth
charge.

23. Furthermore, Cardinal Bellarmine is accused in like manner by Mr. Sutcliffe as a falsary and a gross liar, for reporting out of Calvin, lib. 2, Instit. c. 1, that the image of God was lost in Adam, and that he allegeth for proof thereof these words of Calvin: *per peccatum primi hominis oblitterata est celestis imago*—"by the sin of the first man the heavenly image of God is blotted out;" where (saith Mr. Sutcliffe) both the words and sense of Calvin are falsified: for that he saith only, *quòd tanquam scriptura bella calamo transverso celestis imago oblitterata esset*—"that the image of God was blotted out as a fair writing with the dash of a pen." And who can find any substantial difference between these two speeches, either in sense or words, especially (which is much to be noted), seeing I find that Bellarmine oftentimes (as in this place) doth but relate the sum and substance of the author which he citeth; and then doth Mr. Sutcliffe seek to trip him in words, letters, and syllables, as though he had taken upon him punctually to recite the precise words themselves: yet here I see not any hold to be taken at all. For that if the image of God be dashed out by the sin of Adam as a fair writing with a cross-dash of a pen, then is it lost and cancelled for any use or profit thereof remaining. For if a king, having given a patent of great honour to some man, should after, upon offence, cross, or dash, or blot the same

out again, then might that man be said truly to have lost his patent and all benefit thereof; so as these, in my opinion, are very simple things to be objected for gross lies and falsifications.

24. And yet that Mr. Sutcliffe followeth after such trifles and trivial matters to charge Bel-
The thirteenth charge.
 larmine withal, appeareth not only by this that hath been spoken, but by many more examples, if we would spend time to produce the same; as, among others, he noteth page 147, for an evident untruth against Bellarmine, for that in his book *de Monachis*,* having alleged divers other examples out of the Old Testament for voluntary poverty and chastity of life, he added this sentence: "We have also in the same Old Testament that Elias and Eliseus, and the sons of the prophets, lived without wives and riches in this world," for which the said Bellarmine citeth the testimony of St. Jerome; whereto Mr. Sutcliffe answereth thus: *A plain, an evident untruth (saith he), refuted by a plain text of Scripture, 2 Reg. iv., where we read, how a certain woman of the wives of the prophets cried to Eliseus: as also we read she had sons.* So he. And then triumpheth, saying: *I doubt not but that Owlglass* (meaning, as I am informed, one Mr. Woodward that had learnedly written against divers falsities of his) *will confess this to be a lie.* But when I considered the circumstances, I did not find the matter so clear. For that Bellarmine
About the chastity of prophets and their children.
 speaketh only in that place of the prophets Elias and Eliseus, and such sons of prophets as had separated themselves from cities, and had retired themselves unto the desert about the river Jordan, there to live a more retired and strait life; but that wife of the prophet that came to Eliseus, came out of the city, as by circumstance of the place appeareth,† where, though some prophets and their children did live married, and use lawfully the riches that God had given them; yet others, pretending more perfection, did live chaste, saith Bellarmine, and chose voluntary poverty; which seemeth also to appear clearly by the two places of St. Jerome immediately

* De Monachis, l. 2, c. 5.

† 2 (4) Kings iv.

following in Bellarmine, and alleged by him for proof of his speech, though fraudulently cut off and suppressed

St. Jerome's testimonies about the life of prophets and the sons of prophets.

by Mr. Sutcliffe; the first whereof is in his epistle to the French monk, called Rusticus, where he writeth: *Filii prophetarum, quos monachos in Veteri Testamento legimus, ædificabunt sibi casulas prope fluentia Jordanis, &c.*—"The

sons of prophets, whom we read to have been monks in the Old Testament, did build unto themselves little cottages by the river side of Jordan, and leaving the frequency of cities, lived with barley bread and wild herbs;" and, secondly, in another epistle of his to Paulinus,* Bishop of Nola, extolling the sanctity of monastical life, and antiquity thereof, he saith: *Noster princeps Elias, noster Eliseus, &c.*—"Our captain (in monastical life) was the Prophet Elias, ours was Eliseus, our captains were those children of prophets who dwelt in the fields and in deserts, and did make unto themselves tabernacles near unto the river of Jordan."

25. By which places we see that neither Bellarmine nor St. Jerome, whom he citeth for author of his assertion, doth mean that *all* sons of prophets did live without wives, but such as, leaving the cities and common conversation of men, retired themselves, and chose to live poorly in the wilderness; and though St. Jerome speak not here expressly of marriage, yet, in that he saith they were *Monachi*, which signifieth men that profess sole life, and that they lived so hard in the wilderness with such voluntary poverty, and fled the company and conversation of others, it appeareth evidently that they cannot well be presumed to have had wives and children with them in the desert. So as Bellarmine seemeth easily defended in this, and Mr. Sutcliffe, in his charge, lieth open to sundry reproofs; as, first, in that he concealed the two authorities out of St. Jerome alleged by Bellarmine for his proof; and, secondly, that himself alleged the instance of the prophet's wife living in the *city* far from the purpose, Bellarmine speaking of prophets and prophets' children in the *wilder-*

* Ep. 13 ad Paulinum.

ness; and, finally, in that it may seem, that the cause of his concealing the foresaid places of St. Jerome was fraudulent, to wit, to keep from the reader's eyes the honourable testimony that St. Jerome giveth to monks and monastical life, saying, *That it had for authors and beginners, yea, princes and captains thereof, Elias and Eliseus, John Baptist, and other like saints*; so as by this objection he seemeth to have gotten nothing, but to have lost rather. This do Catholics urge against him.

26. The next objection followeth in the very next place and in the same page, wherein he affirmeth Bellarmine to say, that *ferè omnes patres*—"almost all the fathers write, that St. John Baptist was the first founder of monks and Eremites;" *Monachorum et Eremitarum principem fuisse*; the said Bellarmine citing for the same eight ancient fathers, to wit, Nazianzen, Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome, Cassian, Sozomen, Isidorus, and St. Bernard;* but Mr. Sutcliffe noteth this for a notorious untruth and lie boldly avouched, for that these eight are not *ferè omnes patres* (saith he)—"almost all the fathers;" but it is evident by Bellarmine's discourse that his meaning was of almost all the fathers that wrote of this argument, of the beginning of monastical life, wherein yet Bellarmine doth not say, that St. John was the *first founder*, as Mr. Sutcliffe chargeth him, but *principem fuisse*—a chief and eminent man therein; for that Bellarmine had shewed before out of St. Jerome and others, that long before St. John Baptist was born, the prophets Elias and Eliseus, and the children of the prophets that retired themselves out of towns, and lived with them in little cottages about Jordan, were more ancient authors of that life, which argueth (say they) a mere calumny in this charge of a notorious untruth, and lie boldly avouched, as the objector's words are. And so being forced, for brevity's sake, to be content with these fourteen examples of Mr. Sutcliffe's talent of objecting forgeries and untruths unto Bellarmine, taken out of the beginning, end, and middle of his rank, we shall pass to examine with more brevity some few also of many ob-

* Bellar, ubi supra.

jected against his fellow-cardinal, Baronius, whom in effect I find to be no less injured by Mr. Sutcliffe's accusation of falsities, forgeries, and falsifications, than the other, for any thing that hitherto I can see to the contrary. And so I presume that the discreet reader will also confess when he hath heard what manner of matter, and with what manner of proof, he goeth about to charge him.

CHAPTER III.

Other Imputations of like Lies, Forgeries, and Falsifications objected against Cardinal Baronius by the same author, Mr. Matthew Sutcliffe; and what truth or falsehood I found therein.

MASTER SUTCLIFFE having made so many objections as before you have heard against Cardinal Bellarmine, passeth on to his other fellow, Cardinal Baronius, scoring up fifty-and-two falsities against him; giving this title to his chapter: *A Catalogue of certain Lies and Falsifications of Cæsar Baronius, taken out of a small part of the beginning of his first book of Annals*; and then prosecuteth the matter against him thus: *Now, lest Bellarmine should seem to be in lying and forging singular, I will adjoin unto him his fellow Baronius, a cardinal forger and liar, and he, of all the authors that ever I read, that most impudently abuseth and detorteth Scriptures, contrary to the intention of the Holy Ghost, &c.* This is his preface; and then setteth down the foresaid fifty-two falsifications and lies of his, but with less good success, in my opinion, than before, against Bellarmine; against whom, remembering that he said in his first entrance, or rather, *sworn before God, that Bellarmine's works did confirm him much, that they were more tedious to read than hard to confute*; and after that, perusing what slender charges were brought both against the one and the other, I began to think with myself, whether these speeches of Mr. Sutcliffe were uttered rather for a formality, for that he must needs say somewhat against them, than out of judgment and conscience that he did think them indeed to be guilty of those follies and lies whereof he accuseth them in his ob-

jections. But now let us come to see and consider what he saith in particular against Baronius.

Mr. Sutcliffe's first charge, about a picture. 2. First of all, he carpeth at the very first page of Baronius's first tome or volume, accusing him for having placed the image of the Roman Church in the very front of his book, in form of a woman with a heavy wooden cross on her shoulders, &c., which Mr. Sutcliffe saith *is a notable lie*; for that the Romish Church, that is now possessed of the triple crown, was never subject to the cross of Christ Jesus; for that *the Pope* (saith he) *claimeth a power above all emperors, liveth in delights, &c.* But to this charge I think it not expedient to say any thing; the judicious reader will consider whether it deserve the first place in Mr. Sutcliffe's assault against Baronius; which ought to be of the most substantial matter to begin withal, and not with such childish trifles of images and pictures as these be. And yet hath he not done therewith, as you shall further hear; for he continueth five or six whole and several objections against this picture.

Second charge, about two keys. 3. His second charge, then, is, that whereas the same picture had two great keys of the Pope's cellar (as Mr. Sutcliffe saith) hanging down under it, he chargeth Baronius with an impudent lie, for putting those keys there. *Secondly* (saith he), *he lieth impudently where he signifieth that Christ gave the keys to the Pope and his adherents; for he gave them to Peter, and to such as should succeed him in feeding Christ's lambs; but the Pope now feedeth not, &c.* To this charge also I have little to say, it seemeth so weak a thing; for the Papists will reply, that the succession in power and authority is the point understood by those keys, and not in life or manners, which concern buttry-keys indeed; for that, otherwise, many kings and princes that were of worse life than perhaps their ancestors or first founders may be called in question whether their succession and authority were good and lawful.

Third charge, about the picture's poetry.

4. His third charge is, that whereas the said picture had written under it, on the side, *vici hæreses*, and on the other, *subegit gentes*, that

the Roman Church had overcome all heresies, and subdued nations or Gentiles to her belief; this objecteth also Mr. Sutcliffe for a lie and forgery against Baronius, saying, *that this later Roman Church hath not subdued heresies, but is overgrown itself with heresies*, as, he saith, he hath proved at large in his "Challenge." But all this seemed to me far distant from that which we handle in this place, which is of such untruths as are not only in themselves clearly false, but that also the writer did know them to be such; which were hard in this place to presume of Baronius, for that his whole history is instituted to prove and demonstrate the contrary in both these members here mentioned, to wit, that all heresies, rising from time to time, have been in all ages overcome and suppressed by authority of the universal church, descending visibly from age to age; and that the same church did convert, from time to time, all unbelieving nations, from the first conversion of the Gentiles, in the apostles' time, unto the conversion of the Indians, in these our days. And unto this demonstration made by him, in so many volumes, I do not see how Mr. Sutcliffe's "Challenge" doth answer any thing at all, which these days past I have seen refuted, even in this particular point of old heresies objected on both sides, by one entitling himself W. R., which some, by turning backward the letters, interpret Richard Walpole.* And I have seen so much, and so learnedly spoken, of that controversy in this book, as brought me into a great amaze, and gave me a singular desire to examine that point well, to wit, on which side old heresies are truly found, or colourably objected only, by a certain similitude, likeness, or affinity one to the other; for that I do esteem no one point more effectual to clear the truth between us, in these our days, about true or false religion, than this; for that, in my opinion, wheresoever any one condemned old heresy is truly and really found to be maintained, there cannot be possibly any truth; for that, in the true church of Christ, truth and falsity cannot stand to-

And here old heresies are found.

* Entitled, A Clear Confutation of Mr. Sutcliffe's Vain Challenge, &c. Anno 1603.

gether. Of this point, therefore, I purpose, God willing, to make a particular search hereafter.

*Fourth charge,
about the wo-
man's wooden
cross.*

5. The fourth charge of lies and forgery against this picture is, that Mr. Sutcliffe, supposing that both Baronius and the Pope do mean to worship that wooden cross laid upon the woman's shoulder, that signifieth the church, he saith, *that if Baronius mean the true church, he lieth; for that the true church did never worship any wooden cross.** Which charge, for that it appertaineth to another particular controversy, whether any honour be to be given to images, it shall not be needful for me in this place to discuss; or say any thing about the same, but only to note, that this also is impertinent to our purpose, of wilful forgeries and lies; for that by this means he may call all the points wherein the Papists differ from him lies and forgeries.

*Fifth and
sixth charges,
about subdu-
ing nations,
and the picture
of the Holy
Ghost.*

6. His fifth and sixth charges are yet of less moment than the former; for the fifth is, that whereas in the picture this poesy is found—*subegit gentes*—"the Church hath subdued nations to her belief;" Mr. Sutcliffe saith, *that Saracens, Turks, and Gentiles have prevailed against the Pope and his followers, as may appear by the disastrous attempts made against them for the regaining of the land of Palestine, commonly called the Holy Land; and therefore Baronius plainly coggeth where he telleth us that the Popes have prevailed against the Gentiles.†* Which seemeth to me a strange charge of a lie and forgery; for that all men know that by the church *nations* and *Gentiles* have been converted; which is understood in the words *subegit gentes*, meaning in faith and spiritual matters, and not in temporal wars, as Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth. Wherefore, in my opinion, he saith nothing to the purpose in this place, or rather much against himself, in granting that all the princes of Christendom, in fighting against the Saracens, Turks, and Gentiles, have been the Pope's followers.

7. The sixth is a very trifle, objecting that, in the former picture, the Holy Ghost hovereth over the triple crown, the Blessed Virgin sitteth with her Son in her lap,

* Sutcliffe, p. 162.

† Ibid.

St. Peter and St. Paul support the worship of our Blessed Lady; *which are all* (saith he) *notorious lies; for that Christ is no longer an infant, &c.* So he. But all these things, appertaining to points of doctrine, and not to truth or falsehood of fact, are clean beside our subject and purpose, and do shew rather a will in Mr. Sutcliffe to object much, than that he hath any substantial matter indeed to produce against Baronius. Wherefore we shall pass no further in this battery of his against the picture of Baronius's first page, but shall come to the contents of his volumes, and see what Mr. Sutcliffe bringeth against them; if first we impart with you another idle objection he hath against Baronius about the Pope's licence for printing his first volume.

8. In the seventh place, then, he objecteth ^{The seventh charge.} for a great untruth the decree of Pope Sixtus V. about the edition of Baronius's books. *Sixtus V.* (saith he), *in his decretal epistle prefixed before Baronius's books, saith that he faithfully and diligently reported the story of the church, &c.** But when I had read over the said epistle, I could verily have been angry with Mr. Sutcliffe, in zeal of the honour of Protestants and Protestant writers; for I saw him willingly mistake the mark. For, first, the epistle is not *decretal*, as he saith it is, for that it decreeth nothing, but only giveth him licence and privilege (as all princes are wont to do in like cases) to print his books; and, secondly, the praise that he giveth to his works is not of his own judgment, but by relation of Cardinal Caraffa, that made supplication for the said licence, which appeareth by the words of the same epistle: *Cum dilectus filius noster, &c.*—"Whereas our beloved son, Antony, Cardinal Caraffa (saith the Pope), prefect of the apostolical library, hath related unto us that the first volume of your Ecclesiastical Histories is now ready to be set forth, and that it is a work no less learnedly than faithfully written, and profitable to get the knowledge of all ecclesiastical antiquity, we do give you leave to print the same, &c." By which words is evident, that neither this epistle of Sixtus V. was decretal, nor that

* Sutcliffe, p. 163.

himself commended the work but by relation of others; whereby falleth to the ground all the force of this Mr. Sutcliffe's seventh objection, and leaveth him, in my opinion, much to be suspected of mere malice; for that he could not but know and see the double falsehood which here he useth, which is properly that kind of lying whereof here we treat, when a man so lieth as that he must needs know that he doth lie. And thus you see that all these seven first objected untruths are about the foresaid picture only, in the beginning of the book, and about the licence of Sixtus V. to print the same; and none of them all do concern any asseveration or assertion of Baronius himself. And so we must imagine that Mr. Sutcliffe, having trifled so much in the very entrance, will bestir himself seriously when he cometh into the bulk of the book itself, which now we are to examine.

*Eighth charge.
about different
opinions in
chronology.*

9. Wherefore, in the eighth place he setteth down his battery in these words: *The year* (saith he) *and precise time of Christ's nativity being the ground of all his work, it must needs follow that if he fail in that, then his whole book is nothing but a pack of lies; but that he hath erred in that point is very probable, for that Epiphanius saith our Saviour was born when Augustus and Silvanus were consuls; but Severus writeth that he was born when Sabinus and Ruffinus were consuls; but Baronius followeth neither of these two, but Cassiodorus.** This is his first main assault to prove that the works and volumes of Baronius's History are but a pack of lies; but here I marvelled at this manner of proceeding; for, albeit the knowledge of the true year wherein our Saviour Christ was born be of great moment, as Baronius himself proveth, for the true direction of the years that are to follow in true chronology and account of times; yet if there should be any error in that matter, it maketh not all the rest false that is related in the "History;" as, the beginning and going forward of Christian religion, conversion of nations, councils, synods, condemnation of heretics, and the like, which no man in reason will condemn as false, albeit there were some error in the just account of

* Sutcliffe, p. 164.

years when they were done. And, secondly, whereas Mr. Sutcliffe nameth Epiphanius and Severus to have had different opinions about the years of Christ's nativity, and that Baronius only followeth Cassiodorus, I, going to read the "Apparatus"* of Baronius about that matter, did find the same handled very exactly by him; and that not only Cassiodorus (as Mr. Sutcliffe saith), but a whole multitude of other ancient authors, do stand with him in his account of computation; as, namely, St. Chrysostom, Orosius, Beda, yea, and Epiphanius himself; so as, after much dispute, and many demonstrations brought for the matter, his conclusion is thus: *Prædicta igitur Cassiodori sententia omnium auctorum attestazione firmata atque stabilita habetur* †—"Wherefore the foresaid opinion of Cassiodorus (concerning the year of Christ's nativity) remaineth confirmed and established by the attestation of all authors." So as this appeared to me not only a vain and calumnious objection of Mr. Sutcliffe against Baronius, but wilfully also false; for that Baronius doth not follow only Cassiodorus, as he affirmed, but hath the consent of most other ancient writers. And by this I began to suspect greatly his truth in other accusations against Baronius.

10. And now these eight several charges, being taken without choice, as they lie first in Mr. Sutcliffe's bad dealing with Baronius. Mr. Sutcliffe's book, being so light and vain as we have seen, gave me little courage to go forward in the search. For after I was entered into the bulk of the ensuing objections directed against Baronius's books themselves (for the former were against the picture only, and Sixtus V.'s licence, as you have seen), I found all lightly of one tenor; which was, to carp and scoff at things uttered by Baronius out of certain authors, whose credit Mr. Sutcliffe disgraceth, little respecting oftentimes whether Baronius doth relate them of himself or from others. And for the most part, Mr. Sutcliffe doth not go about to improve ‡ the things by any authority or reason, but only by rejection and contempt; and yet he accuseth Baronius of lying and forgery for the same. I will now repeat four of his last charges, as they stand in his book. The first is

* Apparatus ad tom. i. pp. 46, 47, 48, &c.

† Ibid. p. 49.

‡ [*i. e.* confute.]

the forty-ninth in the order and rank of his book, wherein he accuseth Baronius of lying, for that, out of Euthymius, The ninth charge, about the rich glutton. he relateth that the rich man or glutton (Luke xvi.) was called Ninensis, *and doubteth not to affirm* (saith Mr. Sutcliffe) *that this was a story, and not a parable.** And, suppose all this were true, what manner of lie should this be of Baronius, who, handling this story upon the year of Christ 33, saith: *An parabola esset, vel rei gestæ vera historia, plurimum fuit dubitatio†*—"It hath been a doubt of many men whether it were a parable or an history of a thing truly done." Among which Baronius allegeth this Greek author, Euthymius, who, out of an ancient tradition of the Jews, holdeth that it was a true story, and that the name of the said glutton was Ninensis.‡ But how doth this argue any falsehood in Baronius, who relateth only that which he findeth in Euthymius? And if he do incline more unto that opinion that it was a true story than to the other, which Mr. Sutcliffe holdeth, it is no marvel, having with him the greatest part of antiquity; as Irenæus,§ Tertulian,|| Clemens Alexandrinus,¶ Chrysostom,** Ambrose,†† Origen, Euthymius, and others; so as I wondered that Mr. Sutcliffe would give Baronius the lie upon so slender occasion and false a foundation as this is.

Tenth charge, about the place of our Saviour's eating the passover.

11. His second charge, which is the fiftieth in order and tenth of those which here I have alleged, is thus set down by him: *He would make his reader believe* (saith he) *that our Saviour did celebrate his passover in St. John the Evangelist's house, but Simon Metaphrastes denieth it, which is often alleged by Baronius as a grave witness.* This is the charge: and truly I do not well know what Mr. Sutcliffe would or can mean by this; for if his meaning be, that Baronius holdeth that Christ did sup in St. John's house upon Maundy Thursday, I demand what lie this is to Ba-

* Sutcliffe, p. 199.

† Euthym. in Luc. c. xvi.

|| Lib. de Anima.

** Hom. 6 in 2 Cor., et Hom. de B. Job, et Hom. in Psal. xxv.

†† In Luc. [Narratio magis quam parabola videtur, &c. ii. 1012.]

† Baron. tom. i. A. D. 33, n. 44.

§ Lib. 2, c. 62.

¶ Lib. 2 Pædag.

ronius, in holding that which he thinketh most probable? But when I came to read Baronius, I found him not to hold that opinion, much less persuade it to his reader, as here is charged, but rather the contrary, that it was *not* the house of St. John the Evangelist where our Saviour supped, nor did I find Metaphrastes cited for the contrary by Baronius, but only one Alexander Monachus out of Metaphrastes, Baronius saying thus in his margin: *Habes eum apud Metaphrastem die 11 Junii**—"You may find this author (Alexander Monachus) in Metaphrastes, upon the eleventh of June;" so that although I saw nothing in this objection could touch Baronius's fidelity, yet saw I two manifest untruths in the behalf of Mr. Sutcliffe: the first, that Baronius doth go about to persuade his reader that thing which himself doth not admit, but holdeth for *valde ambiguum* (as his words are)—"very doubtful;" the other, that Metaphrastes denieth the same, and that the same Metaphrastes is alleged as a grave witness by Baronius, than whom no one author is more often reprov'd and rejected by him. Wherefore I could not but marvel much at Mr. Sutcliffe's dealing in this behalf.

12. His last two charges, which are the fifty-first and fifty-second in the order of his book, are much more childish than the former. The fifty-first is set down in these words:† *Baronius saith Missa is derived from the Hebrew or Chaldaic word; but Bellarmine, his fellow, telleth him he is deceived.* And is not this a weighty charge of lying and forgery? Neither doth Bellarmine say that Baronius is deceived, for he wrote before him, and sheweth divers opinions of sundry derivations from sundry tongues and languages, Hebrew, Chaldaic, Greek, and Latin;‡ and though he for his part doth hold for more probable the derivation from the Latin tongue, yet doth he not condemn others that defend other derivations, and so he contradicteth not Baronius, and consequently this seemeth both a vain, false, and impertinent charge.

* Baron. tom. 1, A.D. 34, n. 22.

† Sutcl. p. 179; Baron. tom. 1, A.D. 34, n. 59.

‡ Bellar. l. 1, De Missa, cap. 1.

Quitting
thence, about
things.

13. The last, then, which is the fifty-second objection in his book and twelfth here, and should have been the strongest of all, is a scoff about *things* that measured the pillar whereunto our Saviour was tied, when in his passion he was whipped. *Baronius* (saith he) doth report out of *Gregory of Tours* this fable, that divers making *things*, did put them about the pillar whereto Christ was tied, when he was scourged, and that the same did heal divers diseases, &c. This is the

Concerning
miracles
brought in the
pillar where-
unto our Sa-
viour was
bound when he
was scourged.

worthy charge given by Mr. Sutcliffe; and what appertaineth this to Baronius, if it be a fable, who only reporteth the same out of *Gregory Turonensis*, that wrote it above a thousand years ago? or what doth Mr. Sutcliffe bring to confute the story? Truly nothing but his own bare denial, which is no equal or substantial dealing. For so he may call fables all that any ecclesiastical history hath related about miracles, or admirable things fallen out. You shall hear then what I found in Baronius, for two points he handleth about this pillar, whereunto our Saviour was bound when he was scourged; shewing first out of *St. Jerome* and *St. Bede*, that it remained afterward in the Christian church at Jerusalem sprinkled with the blood of our Saviour; and then for miracles wrought thereby, he reciteth this testimony of *St. Gregory of Tours*, saying, that in his time, *Ad hanc columnam multi fide pleni accedentes, corrigias textiles faciunt eamque circumdant quas rursus pro benedictione recipiunt diversis infirmitatibus profuturas**—"To this pillar many Christians, coming full of faith, do make woven laces or strings (not *things*, as contemptuously Mr. Sutcliffe translateth it), and do wind them about the said pillar, which they receive again with this blessing, thereby to remedy many diseases." And this is all that Baronius hath about this matter, which is so far off from any malicious falsity or fraud on his part, as I marvel how the title of Mr. Sutcliffe's catalogue (which is *Of Lies and Falsifications of Cæsar Baronius*) can be applied thereunto.

* Baron. tom. I. A.D. 34, n. 85; Greg. Turon. de Gloria Martyrum, c. 2.

14. And these dozen of examples shall be sufficient for a taste of the combat between Mr. Sutcliffe and Cardinal Baronius in this kind of objecting untruths ; wherein forsomuch as I found over all his pages these superscriptions of forgeries, lies, and the like, it made me to expect great matters, but being entered into the examen, I found, as you have seen, the sound of much great artillery, but with paper-shot, and therefore we shall pass to a third combat of his, which is more copious, in sight of words, than all the rest, for that it is instituted by him in three several books against Father Persons, who is held also, as before hath been said, to have been the author of the " Defence of the Censure " (by occasion whereof this Search began), and of divers other books since that time. And for this cause it imported me most of all to see whether he were truly convinced* of lying, yea, any one wilful lie, for that this would have been to me of much moment for satisfying my conscience, and direction of my judgment in all my former doubts arising out of the said book of his, the " Defence of the Censure." For if I had once found him evidently to have been convinced of wilful fraud and malice in his writing, I should have distrusted all the rest that he writeth or saith ; for which cause I stood more attent and vigilant in this combat against Father Persons than in all the rest, for that it imported me much more. And for that cause I mean to make a several view thereof out of divers of Mr. Sutcliffe's books written against him, wherein the reader will see such manner of proceeding on his behalf as will little content or edify him, in my opinion. Now, then, to the trial itself.

* [*i. e.* convicted.]

CHAPTER IV.

The Examination which I made of the Falsifications, Lies, and Forgeries objected by the same Mr. Sutcliffe against Father Persons in particular ; and how I was more diligent and attent in this point than in any of the former, and why? And what finally I found therein.

THE reasons touched briefly in the end of the precedent chapter being sufficient to move me to a careful view and perusal of whatsoever Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth against this man and his writings, in divers books written by the said Mr. Sutcliffe, but especially in the three hereafter to be named, I determined to put on a great patience to read over all that about this point he writeth: though here it be not necessary or expedient to cite all or the most part thereof, for it would weary the reader, whom indeed it importeth not so much to remain satisfied therein as myself, for the causes aforesaid of my interest in the matter ; and, consequently, if I myself do rest satisfied therein, he may well think and assure himself that it is upon very just cause, not only the health of my soul, but all other moments also of my worldly affairs in this life depending thereon, I mean of the satisfaction I seek for in this my Search.

*Four books of
Mr. Sutcliffe
against Father
Persons.*

2. Among many books then written by Mr. Sutcliffe against many sorts of men, and this with more labour, as some think, than either judgment or profit, I find four against Father Persons by name ; the first set forth A.D. 1600, containing " A brief Reply to the Warn-word ;" the second divulged two* years after, with the title of " A new Challenge to Per-

* 1602.

sons, Garnet, Blackwell, &c.," and an answer added in the end to certain exceptions (as he calleth them) taken against the same, by Mr. Woodward, named everywhere by him Owlglass. The third, two * years after that again, calling it, "A full and round Answer to Persons's Warnword," &c. And, finally, other two † years after that again, a fourth book, entitled "The Subversion of Robert Persons and his Treatise of three Conversions of England." In the first of these four books, though I find no set collection of lies and falsehoods against Father Persons, yet for that the said father, the very same year 1600, had published a certain relation in print of a trial made in the presence of the King of France, between the Bishop of Euxreux and the Lord Plessis Mornay, about certain points of corruptions and wilful falsifications objected to the said Plessis, and that in the same Relation, Father Persons had avouched that he had found the like falsehood and witting deceit in the writings, as well of our principal English Protestants, as of the said Plessis; Mr. Sutcliffe entering into a great vein of revenge by this occasion, maketh a whole chapter of recriminations, to shew that Papist writers are greater liars than he; which, if he had proved substantially and with particular examples, I should not have thought it far from the purpose; but being only in general terms, that they falsify Scriptures, fathers, doctors, councils, histories, and the like, and against them all in universal, I took no heed unto it, but yet upon the occasion before mentioned, Mr. Sutcliffe, in all his three ensuing works against Father Persons, frameth divers chapters of accusations against him for lying, falsifying, corrupting, and the like abuses, as you have seen him before object against the two cardinals, Bellarmine and Baronius, and with like substance of truth, if I be not deceived; for that his greater anger against him seemeth to have drawn him into a greater passion, and made him less circumspect what he casteth forth against him, so he say somewhat; and this, I suppose, you will see by the sequent examination.

About Mr. Sutcliffe's first book against Father Persons.

* 1604.

† 1606.

Mr. Sutcliffe's second book. 3. In his second work then of the forenamed four, entitled "A renewed Challenge, and Defence thereof," he employeth two whole chapters in this enterprise of objecting lies and forgeries to Father Persons; but I found them to be such trifling things for divers leaves at the beginning, as it loathed me to set them down. For, first,* he maketh a certain recital of most of Father Persons's books, written by him until that day, censuring them, and carping at them with scoffs and contemptuous speeches; as first, saith he, "A brief Discourse," containing certain reasons, why Papists (falsely termed by him Catholics) refuse to go to the church, which he presumeth most impudently to offer to her Majesty. The next (saith he) is called, "A Christian Directory," commonly known by the name of "Persons's Resolution," a most idle and vain discourse. "The first and the second work (saith he) should have had three parts; but, according to his fashion, of three parts promised, he keepeth back two." And again: "We do not find that this Directory hath made any one Christian,† or directed him the way to life," &c. And, finally, he challengeth him "for a notorious falsificator" (to use his words); "that he set forth divers books and pamphlets, under different names and letters, concealing his own name;" which being a charge that may be laid also to Mr. Sutcliffe himself, for that a little before, to wit, A.D. 1600, he published an answer to the "Warn-word," under the letters of "O. E." defendant, I scarce thought it worthy either the reading or the noting, but that I am forced to mention matters as they lie in his book, though never so light and impertinent as they seemed to me.

4. After this again he accuseth him, that Doctor Sanders's book, "De Schismate," was set forth by him, and not by Rishton, and that the story of Friar Forest,‡ in that book, with his Epistles, were feigned by the same. Item, that the "Reasons of Refusal" were not written by John

* Sutcl. in his Defence of his New Challenge, cap. 9 and 10.

† I think no man will say so beside Mr. Sutcliffe.

‡ [Provincial of the English Franciscans. He was executed May 22nd, 1538.—See Dodd, i. 236, and Lingard, vi. 275, note.]

Howlett, but by himself; and these are the first charges or accusations that Mr. Sutcliffe presseth him withal, which seemed to me rather to argue an intention of spending time and wasting paper, than of laying forth any matter of moment or considerable among wise men; yet shall we pass on to examine some few more of his first and principal, as they lay in his book.

5. "To come," saith he, "to particular falsifications, Persons, having so inured his fin- First charge.
gers with this practice that he cannot forget to forge and falsify, you shall find in the margin of his preface (to the 'Directory,') folio octavo, that he saith, *It is an old trick of heretics to abuse simple people with obscure places of Scriptures, citing for the same Epiphanius Contra Hæreses, and St. Augustine ad Quod-vult-Deum, as if they should say so.*"* This he objecteth for a forgery to Father Persons, and biddeth him shew it out of those fathers, under pain to be accounted a falsary; which truly made me to think that Mr. Sutcliffe meant wholly to cavil and wrangle, and not to deal really in any thing: for that all the fathers, without exception, that I have read to have written against heretics, do affirm this point, that heretics do frame and build their opinions upon scriptures misconstrued; yea, it is their whole drift to prove that heretics do build commonly their heresies upon pretended scriptures misunderstood, and thereby do deceive simple people with obscure places that may have divers senses; and for this cause, I doubt not but that Father Persons cited St. Epiphanius and St. Augustine in general in their books written against heretics, without quoting the particular places, for that the substance of that note is everywhere to be found in them, as may be seen by the authorities cited in the margin.† For, first, Mr. Sutcliffe will not deny, but that all heresies commonly are builded upon the misconstruing of

* Sutcl. p. 187.

† Basil. in Hexam.; Cyril. Epist. 18; Chrysost. in Serm. contra Hæres. tom. 3; Hilar. 1. 2, de Trin.; Hieron. contra Luciferian.; Orig. Hom. 31 in Levit. et Hom. 3 in Exod.; Tertul. lib. de Præscrip. advers. Hæres.; Ambrosiaster in cap. 3 ad Tit. Aug. lib. 1, contra Man., et Epistola 62, et Tract. 8 in Joan. et contra Faust. c. 19, et alibi.

scriptures; but plain and evident scriptures cannot so easily be misconstrued; *ergo*, obscure places are these wherewith heretics do abuse the simple. Can any man deny this? And may not as many examples be given thereof as there have been old heresies or new?

6. And to allege some examples: Out of those words of St. Paul, *The God of this world hath blinded them*, the Cerdonists and Marcionists persuaded all their followers that there were two gods, one of this world and another of the next, as both old Irenæus teacheth us, and after him Tertullian:* and out of these words of the said apostle, *Otherwise what shall they do that are baptized for the dead?* the said Marcionists persuaded their followers, that if any of their company died without baptism, they had this remedy for his salvation, that one must be baptized for him in the same coffin or bier wherein the dead body was carried to the grave. So Theophylact, in his commentary upon that place. Out of Epiphanius infinite examples might be alleged, as, namely, in the twenty-fifth heresy, that is of Aerius, whom he saith to have founded sundry heresies upon certain hard and misconstrued places of Scripture, as upon those words of St. Paul, *Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus*—"Christ our pasch is sacrificed;" he founded that erroneous opinion of his, that no external feast at all must be used upon Easter-day. And again, upon that which the said apostle writeth to Timothy, that was a bishop, *Donum quod accepisti per manus presbyterii*, "The gift which thou hast received by the hands of the priesthood," St. Epiphanius saith, that he founded this heresy, that priests were equal to bishops.

7. See St. Augustine, in like manner, *Hæres.* 57, which is of the heretics called Psalliani, who founded their heresy, of continual prayer, without intermission, upon those words of our Saviour, *Oportet semper orare et non deficere*; and, *Hæresi* 59, he sheweth that the heretics Seleucians, out of that place of the Psalm,† *In sole posuit tabernacu-*

* Iren. lib. 3, contra Hæres. cap. 7; Tertul. lib. 5, contra Marcion.

† Psalm xviii.

zum suum—"He hath placed his tabernacle in the sun," do deny our Saviour in flesh to sit at the right-hand of his Father, for that he hath left the same flesh in the sun; and there might examples without end or number be alleged for this, to prove and convince that which Mr. Sutcliffe denieth. But one general assertion of St. Augustine among many shall serve for all, who, in his treaties upon St. John, writeth thus: *Non aliunde natæ sunt hæreses, &c.*—"No other beginning have heresies and perverse doctrines that do ensnare men's souls and precipitate the same into hell;" *nisi cum Scripturæ bonæ intelliguntur non benè, et quod in eis non bene intelligitur, etiam temerè et audacter asseritur*—"but when good scriptures are not well understood, and when that which is not well understood is rashly and audaciously defended."* Wherefore I cannot wonder sufficiently, that Mr. Sutcliffe would be so far overseen as to object this for a lie to Father Persons, for that, in my opinion, it must needs argue his great want of better matter to object against him.

8. Next after this he accuseth Father Persons for many untruths together,† for that in the same preface to his "Directory," folio 10, he affirmeth Luther, in a certain epistle to Joannes Hervagius, a printer of Strasburg, to have written, that the opinion of the Sacramentaries was begun with lies, and defended by the same, &c.; and that Zuinglius,‡ on the other side, writeth of Luther, that he was a foul corrupter and horrible falsifier of God's word, and one that followeth the Marcionists and Arians in razing such places of Holy Writ as were against them: and, thirdly, that Carolus Molinaus § accuseth Calvin, that he made the text of the Gospel (in translation thereof) to leap up and down at his pleasure, &c.; fourthly, that he affirmeth Beza, in his preface of the New Testament, set out A.D. 1556, to accuse Œcolampadius with all his brethren, the divines of Basil, for great impiety in abusing the sacred Scriptures translated by them; but saith Mr. Sutcliffe, *Persons abuseth*

* August. Tract. 8, in Joan. x.

† Sutcl. p. 187.

‡ Zuing. lib. de Sacram. fol. 412.

§ Molin. in præfat. Test. fol. 110.

his reader, in laying that to Beza's charge that was never uttered by him, nor is to be found in that his preface. Hitherto his charge: but yet without quoting any of the authors cited by Father Persons in the margin, whereby his reader might try out the truth of this charge. But I going to search the books themselves, as they were cited in Father Persons's preface, I found all the abuses, indeed, to fall on Mr. Sutcliffe's side; and, particularly, to begin first with that which is here last objected, I find two or three notorious abuses in this one point of citing Beza. For whereas Father Persons doth cite him twice* against two several men, first against the translation of Œcolampadius, quoting him, in *resp. ad defen. Castal.*, as here is recited; and then against the translation of Castalio, affirming his dealing therein to have been ^{fraudulent} ~~proceeding~~ bold, pestilent, sacrilegious, and ethnical, citing for it Beza, in *præfat. Testamenti*, A.D. 1556. Mr. Sutcliffe leaveth quite out all that is alleged against Castalio, citing only that which is spoken against Œcolampadius, but with a false quotation, leaving out the true: charging Father Persons with untruth, for that no such thing, saith he, is to be found in the preface of Beza, upon the New Testament; whereas that preface was not cited by Father Persons, for Beza's words against Œcolampadius, but against Castalio, suppressed by Mr. Sutcliffe. What then shall a man think of this proceeding?

9. Furthermore, whereas he denieth all the aforesaid alleged places, saying, *but who list to peruse the writings of Luther and Molinæus, shall plainly perceive that, like a falsary, he changeth and altereth their words at his pleasure*, it seemed unto me *gratis dictum*, to speak the least; for why had not he shewed what is truly, and what is falsely alleged—what words are changed or altered? Truly I persuade myself, that if he could have proved any such thing, he would not have spared the labour, to disgrace his adversary. Besides, I must confess, that having seen what he denied in the former charge about here—

* Beza in *respon. ad defen. Castalionis*. Item in *Præfat. Test. an. 1556*. [Persons's References, f. 10.]

tics abusing the simple with obscure places of Scripture (a thing so generally held by all fathers that write against them), it moveth me not greatly to see Mr. Sutcliffe deny any thing.

10. Moreover, I thought with myself, what may it avail Father Persons, or his cause, to feign or forge these speeches upon Luther, Zuinglius, and Molinæus, whereas many worse, and more hateful than these, between Lutherans, Zuinglians, and Calvinists, are to be found in chief Protestant writers themselves, as may appear by that which hath been set down in the second part, and fourth and fifth chapters.

11. Lastly, if it were not overlong, I might confound Mr. Sutcliffe, by bringing forth and laying before his eyes, the books here cited, and their proper words in Latin: as of Beza, concerning Œcolampadius's translation, he saith, *In multis locis impia est, et Spiritus Sancti sententiæ prorsus discrepans*—"In many places it is wicked, and altogether disagreeing from the mind of the Holy Ghost." So saith Beza:* and yet was that translation held for Scripture in all Switzerland, and as the word of the Holy Ghost. I might produce also that of Carolus Molinæus, concerning Calvin, to confound Mr. Sutcliffe's denial. *Calvinus in sua Harmonia* (saith he) *textum Evangelicum desultare facit sursum versum, ut res ipsa indicat; vim insert litteræ Evangelicæ, et illam in multis locis transponit, et insuper addit litteræ* †—"Calvin, in his Commentary called the Harmony, maketh the text of the Gospel to leap up and down, as the thing itself sheweth: he offereth violence to the text of Scripture, and moreover addeth of his own to the letter or text." And now let the reader judge whether Father Persons's allegation do agree with this. The other citation of Zuinglius against Luther ‡ saith thus: *Tu Luther, &c.*—"Thou Luther dost corrupt and adulterate the word of God, following herein the Marcionists and Arians, who of old were wont to raze out of the Scriptures such places as seemed to be against their doctrine." So

* Beza in resp. ad defen. et respon. Castal.

† Mol. in sua trans. Testam. Novi, part 11, fol. 110.

‡ Zuingl. tom. ii. ad Luth. de Sacram. fol. 412.

he, which is as much as Father Persons affirmed. As for the saying of Luther against Zuinglius, he that hath read the epistle to Hervagius shall find the same punctually as it is cited. And he that readeth the third chapter of the second part of this narration will see much more to that effect uttered by Luther himself against Zuinglius and Zuinglians; so as all these shifts and negations in this charge do seem rather to convince Mr. Sutcliffe of many falsities, then Father Persons hitherto of any one.

12. After this again, another charge is given *Third charge.* by Mr. Sutcliffe, in these words:* *He citeth St. Augustine, folio 11 of his said preface (saith he), libro 8, Confess. cap. 12, as if he should say that St. Antony had revealed to his mother a religious rule of life, which he should follow. And further, folio 12 (he saith), that Augustine did so reverence Antony's doings, that he made the same a principal motive to his own conversion: but St. Augustine doth not so much as in one word mention any rule of religious life that St. Antony revealed, nor did he follow St. Antony in any other matter than in reading the Scriptures.†* This is the charge, which I conferring with the book and places cited, first I found Mr. Sutcliffe to deal unsincerely in charging his adversary here two or three times to have affirmed that St. Antony revealed to Monica, St. Augustine's mother, a religious rule of life, which the book by him cited, to wit, the preface to the "Directory," doth not so much as mention St. Antony in that behalf, but it is added by Mr. Sutcliffe.

13. As for the *religious* rule there mentioned to have been revealed, it is like that the author of that preface did allude therein unto the vision which St. Augustine mentioneth his mother to have had, in her sleep, from God,‡ of a certain *material* rule, whereupon she saw both her son and herself to stand, when yet he was a Manichean here-

* Sutcl. p. 88.

† ["St. Austin imagined that St. Antony could read no alphabet, and learned by heart and meditated on the Scriptures only by hearing them read by others. . . . When certain philosophers asked him how he could spend his time in solitude, without the pleasure of reading books, he replied, that nature was his great book, and amply supplied the want of others."]—Butler, Jan. 17.]

‡ Lib. 3, Confess. cap. 11.

tic, and no Christian. *Illa* (saith he, speaking to God) *ubi attendit, vidit me juxta se in eadem regula stantem*—"When she looked about, she saw me standing upon the same rule or line with her;" which allegorically might fore-signify, not only that he in time should be of the same religion with her, but follow also the same perfection of life, which she had begun presently after her husband's death, giving all her goods to the poor, as may be seen in the end of the tenth tome of St. Augustine's works, where her life is briefly recounted.* And as for his perfection and regular rule of life, practised after his conversion and being priest, B. Possidius, that lived many years with him and wrote his life, doth testify in sundry places. *Factus presbyter* (saith he), *monasterium intra ecclesiam mox instituit, &c.*†—"He being made priest, presently instituted a monastery within the church, and began to live with the servants of God, according to the manner and rule appointed by the holy apostles, especially that no man should have any thing proper in that society, but that all things should be common." And in another place, speaking of the same rule or order of life, and of such as lived holily under his government and direction, he saith: *Proficiente verò doctrina divina sub sancto et cum sancto Augustino, in monasterio Deo servientes, &c.*—"Whereas divine (and Catholic) doctrine did now grow much under St. Augustine, and with St. Augustine it came to pass that such as did serve God in his monastery began to be ordained priests in the church of Hippo; and then not only the truth of the Catholic Church, being more divulged and made famous from day to day, also the holy purpose of those saints and servants of God in that monastery, which had both his beginning and increase by that memorable man (St. Augustine), coming to light, *continentia et profunda paupertate* (by their observing continency and profound poverty), men began with great desire to demand bishops also out of the same, &c."‡

14. By all which is easily seen that St. Augustine was a famous man in those days for prescribing the form or rule of regular life to the devouter sort of Christians in his

* In narratione de vita, conversatione, ac morte S. Monicæ.

† Possid. in Vita, cap. 5.

‡ Ibid. cap. 11.

time. But as for St. Antony's rule, it is not here mentioned, as hath been said; and I marvel that Mr. Sutcliffe would object it, as much more that he would affirm that St. Antony's doings were no motive to St. Augustine for his own conversion, and that he followed him in no other matter than in reading of Scriptures; which is confuted by so many testimonies of St. Augustine himself, as were a shame to Mr. Sutcliffe to have them here alleged. For that, in his eighth book of "Confessions," from the sixth chapter, where his friend Potitianus began to recount unto him and Alipius, his other friend, the miraculous life of St. Antony, even unto the twelfth chapter, where he recounteth his last conversion, there is nothing so often repeated as the admiration he had at the doings of St. Antony, and the motives thereby towards his conversion.* For, having set down the whole story of Potitianus's narration, he beginneth thus: *Tu autem, Domine, inter verba ejus retorquebas me ad meipsum*—"Thou, O Lord, whiles Potitianus recounted (the life of St. Antony), didst force me to enter into myself." And again, in the last chapter of that book, having recounted the miraculous voice which he had heard in the garden, *Tolle lege, tolle lege*—"Take up and read, take up and read," he said, *Audiveram de Antonio, &c.*—"I had heard of St. Antony, that, going by chance into a church, and hearing those words of the Gospel read, *Go, and sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow me*,† he took those words as spoken to himself, and presently was therewith converted unto thee, O Lord." So St. Augustine. And thereupon sheweth how, making the same resolution, he himself was wholly converted. *Inde ad matrem ingredimur; indicamus, gaudet; narramus quemadmodum gestum sit, exultat, triumphat, et benedicit tibi*‡—"From thence Alipius and I went in to my mother; we tell her of the matter (of my conversion); she rejoiceth; we declare the manner how it fell out; she exulteth and triumpheth, and blesseth thee, O Lord, for the same." And hereby may the reader see, how true it is which Mr. Sutcliffe so seriously affirmeth, that St. Augustine followed not St. Antony in any other matter

* Lib. 8, c. 7.

† Mark x. 11.

‡ Ibid. c. xli.

than in only reading the Scriptures, whereof he saith not so much as one word.

15. Another charge ensueth, which seemeth to me too vain, and somewhat worse. *Per-* Fourth charge.
sons (saith he), p. 64 of his book printed at Louvain, allegeth for his ground the counterfeit writings of *Aristeas*, which he calleth *Aristeus* (without a diphthong), and upon his credit telleth divers histories; but such false grounds are more likely to pervert than to confirm men in their faith.* So he. And this he saith, for that the said *Aristæus* is alleged by Father Persons for confirmation of the truth and authority of the Old Testament, and credit of the Septuagint interpreters. But let any man see the place, and he shall find, first, that in the very place, page, and edition here mentioned, the word *Aristæus* is three times rehearsed with a diphthong; so as this first seemeth a mere calumny. Secondly, A notable cabl about Aristæus. he shall find that the same is written *Aristæus*, and not *Aristæas*, by Eusebius, and so translated by our learned Christopherson. Thirdly, he shall find that the same Eusebius doth cite the said author, *Aristæus*, as an authentic writer, that lived three hundred years before Christ, who, living with King Ptolomy, of Egypt, recounteth the story of the said Septuagint, and the two famous miracles recited by Father Persons of Theopompus and Theodorus, or Theodectes, set down by the said *Aristæus*, confirming the credit, sanctity, and venerable majesty of the Old Testament, that could not be profanely handled by the said two heathen writers. So as this third cavil of Mr. Sutcliffe seemeth to include not only falsity but impiety† also; which being so, I could not but wonder to see Mr. Sutcliffe so resolutely to deny the authority of this received story of *Aristæus*, calling it a counterfeit writing;‡

* Sutcliffe, p. 188.

† [This is unadvisedly said. The "worthiness" of the *Old Testament* is not "discredited and impaired" by discrediting the story of Theopompus being struck with madness, and Theodectes with blindness. Indeed, the narrator seems, by his own way of speaking, to have expected that his story would be generally treated as incredible.]

‡ [A considerable portion of *Aristeas's* letter to Philocrates is quoted by Eusebius (Prep. Evang. l. viii.). At the present day, its authority is justly exploded. Carpzov, de Vers. Gr. lxx. § 2. Ackermann, § 34.]

against which, notwithstanding, he allegeth no one author, reason, or testimony, but only his bare denial, tending to the discredit and impairing of the worthiness of the Old Testament, as you see. And much more did I wonder to see him object for a lie the very alleging thereof by Father Persons, that hath Eusebius for his author, whom in his book he cited; so as here are three manifest untruths contained in this one objection.

Fifth charge.

16. After this, again, Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth a corruption of St. Augustine in these words: "He corrupteth (saith he), p. 259, St. Augustine's words in his book *de Fide et Operibus*, and perverteth his meaning. St. Augustine's words are these: *Quoniam hæc opinio tunc fuerat exorta, aliæ apostolicæ epistolæ Petri, Joannis, Jacobî, Judæ, contra eam maximè dirigunt intentionem, ut vehementer astruant fidem sine operibus nihil prodesse.** These words Persons translateth thus: 'For that this wicked opinion of only faith was sprung up in the apostles' time, by ill understanding of St. Paul; all the other apostolical epistles which ensue, of St. Peter, St. James, St. John, and St. Jude, were directed principally to this end, to prove, with all vehemency, that faith without works is nothing worth.' He addeth to St. Augustine's words, *wicked.*" This is his charge; and who can think that he hath great matters to object against Father Persons, seeing that, from the page 64 to 259, which are almost a hundred leaves, he could find no more to object but that, in Englishing these words, he did add the word *wicked*? which yet is sufficiently expressed in the whole sense and discourse of St. Augustine, who immediately before saith: *Quòd SALUTEM SUAM PERDUNT, qui ad eam obtinendam sufficere solam fidem putaverint*—"That they do destroy their own salvation who think that only faith is sufficient to obtain the same."

Consider whether this wicked opinion be not proper to Protestants.

And a little after that, St. James compareth such men to devils; and consequently it seemeth that Father Persons might rightly call it *wicked*, in St. Augustine's sense, who saith it is pernicious and diabolical. And I cannot but marvel much how Mr. Sutcliffe can object that he perverteth St.

* August. De Fide et Operibus, c. 14.

Augustine's meaning thereby; for that St. Augustine's meaning is plain to impugn and condemn that opinion as wicked and pernicious; *excutiendam à cordibus religiosis*, saith he—a matter to be banished from all Christian hearts, &c. So that here methinketh Mr. Sutcliffe sheweth more desire to object somewhat, though never so weak or from the purpose, than ability to prove false dealing in his adversary.

17. But that other which he objecteth, p. 189, for a lie to Father Persons, or rather for divers lies, is somewhat more ridiculous, for thus he writeth: *Sixth charge.*

*He allegeth, p. 269 (saith he), a counterfeit writing, under the name of Athanasius, wherein St. Antony's life, the hermit, is described, and the lives of Paul and Hilarion, supposed to be Jerome's, but altogether false.** So he. But here methought that Mr. Sutcliffe took a great liberty unto himself, to affirm or deny what he pleased, without authority, witness, reason, or other proof. Suppose the authority of these books were not certain, what lie is it in him that allegeth, as he findeth them under these authors' name? Or what doth Mr. Sutcliffe bring to improve † the same?

18. But I shall deal more substantially with him, and allege him authors for the affirmative; for I find that St. Jerome, in his book of Ecclesiastical Writers, doth affirm St. Athanasius to have written the life of St. Antony in Greek, and that Evagrius translated the same into Latin; yea, and that himself also had made another translation thereof. ‡ Forsomuch, then, as St. Jerome lived so soon after Athanasius, and almost with him, his affirmative, upon his own knowledge, ought to be of much more credit than Mr. Sutcliffe's bare negative, so many hundred years after, without any proof at all. As for the other two lives, of St. Paul and St. Hilarion, the hermits, to have been written by St. Jerome, as in their titles is set down, no learned men of any age are recorded to have called the matter in doubt; but now only in ours, some that are offended with divers things written therein in favour of the Roman religion

* Sutcliffe, p. 189.

† [*i. e.* disprove.]

‡ Hieron. de Script. Eccl. in Evagrio, et Epist. 101.

do call it into question. And this shift of denying, or calling in doubt without proof, whatsoever maketh against a man, seemeth a very easy and silly shift to me.

19. As for the other objection that ensueth
Seventh charge. in the same page, there be divers charges given therein by Mr. Sutcliffe which return upon himself; and I am astonished to see him deal as he doth; for, speaking of his adversary, who, p. 353, in the book of "Resolution," going about to animate good men to die with comfort, addeth an excellent example out of St. Cyprian, of Christ's appearing in the form of a goodly young man unto a certain bishop, that was greatly afraid on his death-bed, Mr. Sutcliffe thereupon giveth this charge: "He maketh Cyprian (saith he) to say, that Christ appeared to a bishop in the form of a goodly young man: he saith, also, that St. Augustine did often use to recount this example, and allegeth Posidonius for his witness: he saith further, that Cyprian wrote a book *de Mortalitate*; but, first, this discourse is but one poor sermon, and no book; secondly, it is uncertain whether this sermon was his, or no; thirdly, he saith not that Christ appeared, but that a goodly young man appeared to that priest; fourthly, he lieth as well of St. Augustine as of Cyprian, and forgeth in his allegation."* So he.

20. And truly I find so many falsehoods and immodesties in this his charge, as would require too long answer to recount the same only. For, first, to begin with St. Cyprian, he hath the very story and words set down in the book of "Resolution:" *Astitit deprecanti, et jam pene morienti juvenis, honore et majestate venerabilis, &c., et dixit, Pati timetis, exire non vultis, quid faciam vobis?*†—"There appeared unto him, as he was praying, and now ready to die, a young man, venerable for honour and majesty, &c., and said unto him, 'You are afraid to suffer, and yet you will not go out of the world; what shall I do unto you?'" Here, then, we see that Christ appeared; for that no man could use this speech with such authority but he. This, then, is the first vain and false denial of Mr. Sutcliffe.

* Sutcliffe, p. 189.

† Cyprian, lib. de Mortalitate.

21. The other is no less false, that this book *de Mortalitate*, here cited, is no book, nor written by Cyprian; for that it is a book, appeareth by the common citation thereof under that name, which may be seen also in the edition of Pamelius, which is the last and most exact edition * of St. Cyprian's works; and that it was written by St. Cyprian (in time of a great plague, when he desired to encourage good Christians against the fear of death and mortality), doth testify not only Pontius, St. Cyprian's deacon, that wrote his life, but also St. Augustine, in his book against Julian the Pelagian, and elsewhere.† And I marvel that Mr. Sutcliffe will call it not only a sermon, but a *poor sermon*; being as excellent a thing, for the greatness thereof, as any commonly you shall find in St. Cyprian. And whereas, further, he addeth that Father Persons belieth not only Augustine and Cyprian, but also Possidius or Possidonius (for both names are ascribed to one man), it seemeth a strange boldness, ready to deny or affirm any thing; for that of St. Cyprian, we have now seen that he hath the words alleged; and as for St. Augustine, Possidius,‡ in his life, writeth expressly that he used, among other examples of like argument, to recount this history; and he setteth it down in the very same words of St. Cyprian which we have now recounted; neither is there any place left for evasion or tergiversation to Mr. Sutcliffe in this matter, but that, in going about to charge his adversary with one falsity, he is convinced to have uttered divers himself, and those inexcusable.

22. There followeth, in the eighth place of his particular charges, where he accuseth Father Persons of forgery and lying, for that he allegeth divers examples of apparitions of Christ and his angels to men that lay a-dying, citing divers testimonies for the same (besides the former of St. Cyprian and Possidius, out of St. Augustine); as St. Gre-

Eighth charge, about apparitions to men that lay a-dying.

* [And subsequent ones; as that by Bishop Fell, at Oxford, in 1682. *Librum hunc anno 252 conscriptum, idque ante redintegratam persecutionem, adstipulante tractatus totius tenore, pronunciamus, &c.*—Fell, p. 156.]

† Pontius, in Vita Cypr.; Aug. lib. 2 advers. Julian., and l. 4 contra Duas Epist. Pelag. c. 8, and de Prælect. Sanct. cap. 17.

‡ Possid. de Vita Aug. cap. 27.

gory and Venerable Bede; and for that out of St. Augustine he quoteth, besides his book *de Vanitate Sæculi*, a sermon also, *ad Fratres in Eremo*, which is the fiftieth sermon in his tenth tome, written, no doubt, by some ancient author, if not by St. Augustine himself. Mr. Sutcliffe exclaimeth in these words: "He allegeth ridiculously certain sermons *ad Fratres in Eremo*, which he fathereth most falsely upon St. Augustine. He telleth certain fables of apparitions of good and bad angels, and layeth them upon Gregory the Dialogist and Bede, whose books are much corrupted by monks and such like falsaries."* So Mr. Sutcliffe. Wherein, first, I marvel what forgery or lie it could be in Father Persons to cite St. Augustine's sermons *ad Fratres in Eremo*, which so long have passed in his name, and have been usually so cited by learned men of former times. And yet, in the last edition of the said "Directory," I find that testimony left out† by Father Persons, and only that other of St. Augustine, *de Vanitate Sæculi*, remaining, which here Mr. Sutcliffe concealeth, as not alleged at all.

23. And as for the place of St. Gregory, in his fourth book of "Dialogues," and tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fifteenth, and thirty-eighth chapters, where the like apparitions are recounted by him to that which St. Cyprian and St. Augustine related before, and Venerable Bede, in his fifth book of our English History, in the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters, if this rejection used by Mr. Sutcliffe were sufficient to say they were corrupted by monks and such like falsaries, themselves also being monks, I see not what may not be rejected, by like kind of answering. Sure I am that the Magdeburgians, as judicious Protestants as Mr. Sutcliffe, in their sixth and eighth "Centuries," do not use any such accusations of any corruptions or falsifications used by others upon these men's works. And it seemeth that Mr. Bunny used more discretion, in that he thrust out wholly from the text of

* Sutcliffe, p. 182.

† [And justly; for the work is not St. Augustine's. As to the book *De Vanitate Sæculi*, Natalis Alexander rejects it, as "unworthy of St. Augustine." The censure is equally applicable to the greater part of the former.]

he "Directory" (which he published and trimmed up to his own fashion) these testimonies of St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, St. Gregory, and Venerable Bede, according to the note in the margin, which saith: *Note here, that Mr. Bunny rejecteth not only this authority of St. Cyprian and Possidius, but also the whole discourses following of St. Augustine, St. Gregory, and Venerable Bede, for that they talk of apparitions.* So there. But Mr. Sutcliffe striketh out all this very marginal note, and saith not one word hereof; and further also feigneth, that the works of St. Gregory and Venerable Bede are falsified by monks. So is all things here are called into question, as you see, and nothing is certain, but Mr. Sutcliffe's word alone, though he bring neither author, nor reason, nor argument for his proof. And then I thought with myself who, think you, might not answer all books that come in this manner, and with this facility of rejection?

CHAPTER V.

Of other Eight of Mr. Sutcliffe's Charges against Father Persons, as they lie together in the end of his battery.

AND albeit these might suffice to take a taste of Mr. Sutcliffe's objecting forgeries and lies of Father Persons in this place, yet as we have examined the former eight several charges as they lie, without choice, in the beginning of his whole rank, that amount in his book to the number of sixty-two, so will we peruse also the like number of others that stand last in his book;* and these, as before hath been noted, to the end he may not say we have chosen or picked out the weakest of his objections. And for that the first and last places are wont to be furnished with his strongest arguments, let us see whether it be so in Mr. Sutcliffe, or no.

*First charge,
about presence
of angels at the
sacrifice.*

2. Wherefore, his first charge of these last eight, being of his whole number the fifty-fifth, is set down thus; charging Father Persons that, in his "Reasons of Refusal," he saith *That angels are present at the elevation of the sacrament of the Lord's body, as all holy fathers teach; and yet can he not bring (quoth he) one holy father that alloweth this elevation that he prateth of, or that affirmeth this of the substantial presence of angels.* Thus Mr. Sutcliffe. But when I went to the said treatise, to behold what Father Persons writeth of this matter, I could not but wonder at Mr. Sutcliffe's manner of charging his adversary, without any respect to truth at all, as to me it seemed; for that Father Persons, talking in that place of the dignity of the external sacrifice offered by the priest upon the altar, doth, instead of one holy father, required here by Mr. Sut-

*Eighth reason
of refusal.*

* Defence of his Challenge, p. 204.

cliffe, allege two, in name of the rest, setting down also their very words, which Mr. Sutcliffe dissembleth egregiously, thereby to avoid, as it seemeth, the obligation to answer them. And yet is not ashamed to say, Shew me but one; yea, and to accuse his adversary of lying, for shewing none, who sheweth two, and that in sundry places of their works; and for better proof, I shall pray you to have patience to let me set down Father Persons's own words in that place; which are these that ensue, treating of the spiritual losses which those of his religion did receive in going to churches of different religions, whereby they are debarred (saith he), among other things, from the participation of mass and public sacrifice used in the Catholic Church; which loss, how highly he holdeth to be esteemed, he sheweth, among other arguments, by the said presence of angels affirmed to be at the consecration and sacrifice of the mass. His words be these:—

3. "First, then (saith he), a Catholic man, by going to the Protestant churches,* loseth all participation of that blessed sacrifice of the body and blood of our Saviour, appointed by the said Saviour (as I have shewed before) to be offered up daily in the oblation of the mass for the commodity of the whole world, quick and dead, and for that cause (as the godly and learned St. John Chrysostom† saith) called the common sacrifice of the whole world. The which action of offering of this sacred host (the Son of God to his Father) is of such dignity, excellency, and merit, not only to the priest, but also to the standers-by assisting him, as all the other good works which a man doth in his life are not to be compared with it, seeing that the very angels of heaven do come down at that time to adore (after the consecration) that sacred body, and to offer the same up with us to God the Father for the whole world, as all the holy fathers of the primitive church did both believe and teach: of the which, it shall be enough at this time to allege one or two. St. Gregory,‡ therefore, first, saith thus: 'What faithful man can doubt but that

The loss of participation of the sacrifice, how great a loss.

The angels present at the elevation.

* Reasons of Refusal, fol. 45, 46.

† Chrysos. Hom. 47, in Ep. 1 ad Corinth. ‡ Greg. l. 4, Dialog. c. 58.

in the very hour of immolation or sacrifice, the heavens do open at the priest's voice, and that the choirs of angels be present there in that mystery of Jesus Christ?' And St. Chrysostom,* handling the same, saith: 'At that time (the time of consecration in the mass) the angels stand by the priest, and the universal orders of the celestial powers do cry out, and the place nigh to the altar is full of choirs of angels, in the honour of him who is there sacrificed.'

Two visions of the presence of angels at the mass.

And, immediately after, he telleth two visions of holy men, whose eyes were by the power of God (as he saith) opened, and they in those

visions saw the angels present at that time of consecration. And, in another place, he yet more at large explicateth the same, saying:† 'At that time, dear brother (at the time of consecration and elevation), not only men do give out that dreadful cry, saying, "We adore thee, O Lord," &c., but also the angels do bow their knees to our Lord, and the archangels do beseech him; for they account that fit time, having that sacred oblation in their favour. And therefore, as men are wont to move princes

A fit similitude of St. Chrysostom.

the more if they bear olive boughs in their hands (because by bearing that kind of wood they bring into the princes' mind mercy and gentleness); so the angels, at that time, holding out in their hands the very selfsame body of our Lord, they do entreat for all mankind, as though they said, 'We do entreat thee, O Lord, for the men of the world,

What plainer testimony can there be than this?

whom thou hast so loved, that for their salvation thou wast content to die, and on the cross to breathe out thine own soul; for these men we make supplication, for the which thou hast given thine own blood; for these men we pray, for the which thou hast sacrificed this body of thine.'

4. Thus there. And now let the reader consider the diversity of shifts and falsehoods used here by Mr. Sutcliffe to make his objection seem somewhat against Father Persons. For, first, he perverteth his words, making him to say that angels are present at the elevation of the sacrament of the Lord's body, as though he confessed that it were only the sacrament of Christ's body, and not his

* Chrysost. l. de Sacerdotio.

† Chrysost. Hom. 3, contra Anom.]

real body, and as though he spake of the sacrament, and not of the sacrifice, and as though he affirmed the angels to be present at the elevation and not consecration, which is the word thrice used by him, though once also he adjoin to consecration the word *elevation*, in respect of the common use thereof; but it is plain that Mr. Sutcliffe doth of fraud omit wholly the other word of *consecration* (which is the substantial, whereby Christ is made present), and useth the word *elevation*, as though, if there were no *elevation*, the angels, in Father Persons's opinion, would not be there; whereas the said father placeth the force out of the fathers' authority alleged, in the word *consecration*, or immolation, as St. Gregory speaketh. And if those words of St. Chrysostom, here cited, be true, *that the angels at that time, holding out in their hands the very selfsame body of our Lord, do entertain for all mankind, their holding out Christ's body in their hands must needs be also a kind of elevation in their behalf, besides the priest.*

Variety of shifts in Mr. Sutcliffe.

5. And as for the last refuge of Mr. Sutcliffe, that no one father affirmeth this of the substantial presence of angels, I know not what distinction he will make here, of substantial and accidental presence. Sure it is, that the alleged fathers do speak plainly enough of this real and true presence, and that I take to be substantial in this matter. So as by all these shifts a man may see that Mr. Sutcliffe is sore pressed to find out a lie on Father Persons's behalf. And his demand for one holy father, where himself must needs see that his adversary had alleged two (and that in different places of their works so largely set down, as before you have heard), doth shew a strange resolution of boldness to say any thing.

6. There followeth the second charge of these last eight in these words: *Persons saith that St. James speaketh of extreme unction, which is extreme impudency to affirm, unless he can prove it.** A short, but sharp onset, as you see. But let us hear Father Persons's own words in the place cited, for they are very few. *The grace (saith he) of extreme unction is so great, that, as St. James saith, besides the healing many*

Second charge, about extreme unction.

* Sutcliffe, p. 104.

times of the body, it also remitteth the sick man's sins. What impudency is there here? St. James's words are these: *Infirmatur quis in vobis, &c.*—"Is there any man sick among you? let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of our Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick; and our Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins they shall be remitted unto him."* Which is so much as Father Persons avouched;† and so this objected impudency, in my opinion, either remaineth or returneth to Mr. Sutcliffe himself.

This charge.

7. Next after this, he objecteth in this manner: *Persons affirmeth, that we have no reason to allege against Papists, but only temporal commodity, as if all that have died for the truth have respected temporal commodity, or as if we did not urge them with the truth of apostolical doctrine and the ancient Christian faith.* In which words, truly, according to my judgment, I find plain calumny to be used; for that Father Persons, treating of the state of things as they be now in England between Protestants and those of his religion, seemeth first to hold that none can be thought to be drawn to his said religion in these our days by any allurements of temporal commodities. Forsomuch as all such commodities are now of the Protestants' side; and, secondly, that if matters and men be well considered, very few that have once been well instructed in Catholic religion are drawn to be Protestants, but for respect of some temporal commodities, or carnal, which are often more strong than other temporal.

8. And, in this point, I have heard some of that religion to make sundry observations of such as have fallen from them, which they term apostates, who fell, as they say, from them principally upon these motives of good fellowship, good cheer, loose life, and women; and they give for examples, Messrs. Bell, Shaw, Tyrrell, Tydder, Mayre, Sacheverell, Bayly, Ithell, Skidmore, Rouse, and such like, who yet (say they) notwithstanding never lightly changed their judgments in religion, but only their affections for enjoying their appetites for some time; but yet afterward,

* James v.

† Reasons of Refusal, p. 47.

that being satisfied, they had many motions to return, if they might do it with their safety, as they say hath been made manifest by such as have indeed returned; as, namely, Shaw and Tyrrell, who, after many years living with wives, left them and went over the sea to do penance,* which they performed with great austerity against themselves for their former looseness; the one dying in Naples, the other in Flanders, and confessing publicly, that whilst they preached most earnestly in defence of Protestant religion, they never believed it to be true, but only desired thereby to enjoy their sensualities. And the like they protested to know of sundry of their fellows before mentioned, though they have not yet received (say they) so great grace as the other did, to break from all at once and put their better desires in execution. And thus much have I received by information of such as pretend to know it very precisely. This then being the effect, as it seemeth, of Father Persons's meaning, it is but vainly objected by Mr. Sutcliffe, that such as died for Protestant religion in Queen Mary's days, respected not temporal commodities, for then the case was otherwise, the said temporal commodities not standing on the Protestant party, as now they do, the state and commonwealth favouring them, of which present state it appeareth evidently that Father Persons's words and meaning were.

9. Immediately again after this, he maketh a new charge upon Father Persons of four lies together.† *In his preface (saith he) of his Directory, he saith that St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Gregory, and St. Bernard persuade men by their examples to be afraid of purgatory. A fourfold lie, for neither did St. Ambrose nor any of the rest speak of a purgatory wherein Christians did satisfy for the temporal punishment of sins committed in earth, nor did they believe any such purgatory.* This he saith, but allegeth no one proof or authority for the same, which I would have been glad to have seen. Nay, I find marvellous slippery dealing in this

Fourth charge,
about purga-
tory.

* And now lately Mr. Rouse, who liveth, as I understand, in Flanders, where he persevereth in daily prayer and penance with no small comfort to his own soul, and to the great edification of others.

† Sutcliffe, p. 205.

matter, for that in the preface * of the "Directory," mentioned by Mr. Sutcliffe, Father Persons doth only rehearse what manner of striking out the names and authorities of ancient fathers Mr. Bunny did use in the former edition of the said book, when they made against him in the controversies of our times; and amongst others he, talking of *purgatory*, writeth thus of Mr. Bunny: *He thrusteth out in like manner, p. 109, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Gregory, and St. Bernard altogether, for that they persuaded men by their examples to be afraid of purgatory.*

10. But I marvel why Mr. Sutcliffe, after he had passed the preface, and waded far into the "Directory" itself in the beginning of these objections, as you may see by the 353rd page, before cited by him in the seventh objection, would steal back again into the beginning, as it were, of the same preface, to fetch thence this objection, which he passed over before, and would not rather mention the place itself of the "Directory," † where these four fathers' authorities and words are set down at large.

11. And certes there could be no other reasons, in my comprehension, but only that he was afraid to have his reader see and read the words of the said fathers, which are most evident against him and his assertion. For St. Ambrose, in the said "Directory," ‡ is cited in two several places, shewing his great fear of the pains of purgatory. *O Lord (saith he), if thou reserve any thing in me to be revenged in the next life, yet humbly I beseech thee give me not up to the power of wicked spirits, whilst thou wipest away my sins by the pains of purgatory.* St. Augustine also is alleged in two or three large discourses, wherein the grievousness of the purging fire is set forth by him to the terror of the reader. "Though men shall be saved (saith he) §

* Preface, fol. 13.

† Pages 369, 370, 371.

‡ Ambros. Precat. Præparat. 2 ad Missam;—Dùm scelus meum Purgatoria poena detergis. [The prayer, though undoubtedly ancient, is not the composition of St. Ambrose.] Ambros. Sermo 20 in Psalm cxviii. [ii. 671, ed. Ven. Persons has given the passage in English. The words of the original are as follows: St. Ambrose says, in reference to Ecclus. ii. 5 ("in fornace"), and to Ps. lxxvi. 10 (*igne nos examinasti*):—sed ille examinabitur ut argentum, ego examinabor ut plumbum; donec plumbum tabescat ardebo. Si nihil argenti in me inventum fuerit, heu me! in ultima inferni detrudar, aut ut stipula totus exurar.]

§ August. in Psal. xxxvii. et Hom. 16, ex 50.

by it, yet is this fire more grievous than whatsoever a man can suffer in this life, albeit you know how great and intolerable things men have or may suffer." And the like hath St. Gregory: "Because I esteem (saith he) that purging fire, though it be transitory, to be more intolerable than all the tribulation which in this life may be, I do not only desire of God not to be rebuked in the fury of eternal damnation, but also do greatly fear to be purged in the wrath of transitory correction."* And, finally, St. Bernard is also alleged to the same purpose, of his fear of this purging fire: "I tremble and shake for fear (saith he) of falling into God's hands. I would gladly present myself before his face already judged of myself, and not to be judged then of him. Therefore I will make a reckoning whilst I am here, both of my good deeds and of my bad; mine evil works shall be corrected with better, they shall be watered with tears, they shall be punished by fasting, they shall be amended by sharp discipline, &c., for so perhaps the burning fire shall take no hold, where running tears have cleansed before."†

12. Now, then, let the reader consider, whether this be a fourfold lie on Father Persons's side, or rather a multiplicity of lies of Mr. Sutcliffe, to wit, as many as here be sentences of those four fathers alleged. And, surely, for Mr. Sutcliffe to object a fourfold lie, and prove never a one, but that all are proved against himself, was a shameless overlashing, in my opinion, and little respect to his own credit, not to name conscience, which seemeth furthest from his thought. There remain other four accusations that are the last of this rank, whereof two are about Socrates and Zeno, the philosophers, ^{† fifth charge, about Socrates.} whom Father Persons (treating of the eminency of one only God) doth cite among many others of their profession, though Gentiles, as confessing the said

* Greg. in Psal. iii. penitent. ["The commentary on the seven penitential psalms Ceillier thinks to be St. Gregory's work: but it seems doubtful." —Alban Butler.]

† Bern. Serm. 55 in Cantica. [iv, 2999 of the new Paris edit. The clause "for so perhaps," &c., is taken from the Sermo 28 de Diversis, where the same subject is treated. Utinam magis nunc daret quis capiti meo aquas, et oculis meis fontem lachrymarum: forte enim non reperiret ignis exurens, quod interim fluens lachryma diluisset.—p. 2402.]

being of only one God, and contemning the Paynims* multitude thereof, brought in by Gentility; against which Mr. Sutcliffe, in favour, as it were, of paganism, carpeth in this manner.

13. "In his 'Directory' (saith he), p. 42,† he affirmeth that the world knoweth that Socrates was put to death for jesting at the multitude of gods among the Gentiles, a matter which the world knoweth to be a lie, and is refuted by Plato, and all that write of his death. And in the same place Persons saith (quoth he), that Plato was wont to report of Zeno, the stoic, that he should say, that either there was one God, or no God, but the record of the report will not be found. And if Plato lived before Zeno, it is not like that he should prophesy what Zeno would say: certes, the lies being the grounds of Persons' proof, where he goeth about to shew that there is a God, are rather like to make a Gentile or heathen man obstinate than to make him believe in one God."

14. Hitherto is Mr. Sutcliffe's accusation, which I repairing to Father Persons's book to consider of, I confess that I had almost lost all patience in beholding this manner of dealing, doubting indeed with myself, whether men that truly believe one God, as rewarder and punisher of good and evil, truth and lies, could proceed so perversely and fraudulently as this man seemeth to do. For first I found that Father Persons, in the place quoted, following therein the example of all the ancient fathers that have written against Gentiles for Christian religion, as Justinus Martyr, Tertullian, and others, in their Apologies; Lactantius, Eusebius, Arnobius, Nazianzen, St. Augustine (*de Civitate Dei*, and in other treatises of that matter), when they go about to prove the being of one only true God against the multiplicity and falsity of heathen gods, do among other arguments urge this, that the old philosophers, of all sects, do either plainly or covertly confess the same. For which Father Persons allegeth so great abundance and variety of examples and authorities as may worthily shame and confound Mr. Sutcliffe, to have his reader but to look into that place cited by him in the

* [*i. e.* Pagani.] † Sutcliffe in Defence of his Challenge, p. 205.

“Directory;” forsomuch as himself most unlearnedly, without citing any one author for himself, presumeth to contradict, by his bare negative, so great a multitude of irrefragable authors cited by his adversary. And for his greater confusion in this behalf, I entreat the reader to look upon the pages here quoted in the “Directory,”* for I assure myself that he will go near to lose his patience also, as well as myself, in beholding such perverse and shameless behaviour: and I speak now as one that hath lost his patience indeed. But let us examine the particulars, and then let the discreet reader judge whether I have just cause or no.

15. First, for Socrates, after that Father Persons had shewed the opinion of divers other sects of philosophers, out of their own principal writers, and of Plato in particular, he writeth thus of Socrates:† *And as for Socrates (saith he), that was Plato's master, and pronounced by the Oracle of Apollo to be the wisest man of all Greece, the world knoweth that he was put to death for jesting at the multitude of gods among the Gentiles.* And this, saith Mr. Sutcliffe, is a matter which the world knoweth to be a lie, and is refuted by Plato, and all that write of his death.

16. Here then are two points to be considered: First, whether it be a known lie to the world, that Socrates was put to death for contemning and denying the Pagan gods of the Athenians? and the second, whether it be refuted by Plato, and all that write of Socrates's death? For thus much Mr. Sutcliffe affirmeth. And, for the first, if it were so known a lie, we must confess in like manner, that all the gravest authors which ever wrote of this matter, who are many, both Pagan and Christian, were liars also in that behalf, and defenders of this lie. And, first, Father Persons, in his margin, citeth three ancient Pagan writers that testify the same, which are Apuleius, Agellius, and Laertius. Why did Mr. Sutcliffe not so much as mention these that stood in his adversary's margin? especially forsomuch

*For what cause
Socrates was
put to death.*

* Directory, pp. 40, 41, 42, 43, edit. of Louvain.

† Directory, part 1, c. 2, p. 42.

as St. Augustine, in his eighth book of the "City of God," and fourteenth chapter, testifieth, that the first of these three, to wit, Apuleius, wrote a special book, whose title was *De Deo Socratis*—"Of Socrates's God." And the last of them, which is Diogenes Laertius, that wrote ten books of the lives and doctrines of philosophers, treating in his second book of the life and death of Socrates, and of the cause of his condemnation, saith, that the chief of his accusers, Melytus, did object unto him for his principal accusation, that he denied the Athenians' gods:* *Accusavit Melytus* (saith he) *Socratem de his criminibus: jura violat Socrates quos ex majorum instituto suscepit civitas, deos esse negans*—"Melytus did accuse Socrates of these crimes: that he did violate the laws of the commonwealth, denying them to be gods which the city had received for gods by institution of their ancestors."

17. And to these Pagan testimonies, which are of most force in this matter, we may add another of greatest authority of all others, which is Plato himself, who being Socrates's scholar, wrote an Apology for him, in defence of his honour, which, according to the translation of Marsilius Ficinus, is the twenty-seventh book amongst Plato's works: in which Apology he setting down at large the order of Socrates's arraignment, judgment, and condemnation, together with the accusations of his three adversaries, Melytus, Anytus, and Lyco, doth evidently confirm the same which Father Persons affirmed; to wit, that he was accused for corrupting the youth, and contemning the Athenians' gods. *Juventutem depravat, et deos quos civitas putat, ipse non putat, sed alia quædam nova dæmonia inducit*—"Socrates doth deprave the youth of the city of Athens, and doth not think those to be gods which the commonwealth holdeth for gods, but bringeth in certain new devils not heard of before." And in the end of the said Apology, Plato sheweth, that upon these principal criminations he was condemned: first, as Laertius † saith, by the sentence of two hundred and eighty-one judges;

The manner of
Socrates's
judgment, and
his three ac-
cusers.

* Diog. Laer. in Vita Socratis, circa finem.

† Plato in Apolog. Socratis.

‡ Diog. Laert. ubi sup.

afterward, upon his reply, that he had been benefited to the commonwealth, and deserved to be maintained by public expense of the city, he so exasperated the judges, that eighty more gave sentence against him, so as condemnation was by three hundred and sixty-one judges. So Plato and Laertius: and these are sufficient heathen testimonies.

8. There followeth the testimony of the most learned Josephus,* in his second book against Apion, the Egyptian grammarian, where, talking of the severe laws which the heathen commonwealths had for maintenance of their false gods, and severe punishment of them that would impugn, condemn, or doubt of the same, saith, *vel verbo solummodo, præter illorum legem, de diis sententes, inevitabiliter punierunt: cujus enim rei gratia creatus est mortuus?* &c.—“They did punish without compassion whosoever did speak any one word against their gods, contrary to their law. For why died Socrates? Not because he delivered up the city to their enemies, nor for that he destroyed their temples, but only for that he did swear certain new oaths,† and affirmed that he signified thereby a certain devil, whether in earnest or in jest, as the men say; certain it is, that for this he was put to death, by causing him to drink a cup of poison.” So far Josephus.

9. But much more might be said out of Christian ancient writers, as, namely, out of Justinus Martyr, in his oration to the Gentiles, where he hath these words: *to videtur*, &c.‡—“Plato seemeth in his writings to acknowledge the doctrine of Moses and the prophets, concerning one only God, which he had learned in Egypt: yet fearing for that accident fallen to Socrates, least some Melytus, or Anytus, or some other such accuser might arise in like manner against him, and cry out to the Athenian people, Plato hath violated the laws, and doth not hold for gods those whom the city doth adore; for this cause (I say) and for

Plato afraid by
Socrates's example.

* Joseph. Judeus, lib. 2, contra Apionem, ad finem.

† By a dog and a cock.

‡ Justin. Serm. exhort. ad Gentes, circa medium.

fear of a cup of poison, Plato doth disguise his speech in such sort, as he leaveth matter as well to them that confess many gods as deny them, to apply it to their purpose." So St. Justin, in the very next age after the apostles. And in the end of the next ensuing age, followed Eusebius Pamphyli, who in his seventh book, *De Præparatione Evangelica*, giveth this title to the fourth chapter: *Quod Socrates, quia Gentilium deos spernebat occisus sit**—"That Socrates was put to death for that he contemned the gods of the Gentiles:" and he proveth the same out of Plato's *Enthyphrone*, and out of Numenius, *De Arcanis Platonicis*, two irrefragable authors.

20. I premit what Lactantius Firmianus wrote, at the same time, of Socrates's contempt of the Athenian gods (and St. Augustine, in the next age after the former), condemning him of scurrility, saying, *O hominem scurrant!*†—"O scurrilous man! that scoffing at the Athenian gods (whereby other men did swear), made a dog his god, by swearing by him." But the latter father, good St. Augustine,‡ doth excuse Socrates, as having a higher meaning therein than was vulgarly conceived; but yet both of them confirm this point so boldly and resolutely denied by Mr. Sutcliffe, that for his external jesting and contempt of the Athenian gods, he was condemned and put to death; which is *the notorious lie*, that Mr. Sutcliffe saith to be a known lie to the whole world. But did the world ever know a lie more notoriously avouched than Mr. Sutcliffe doth this? Or will he have more witnesses to convince him than these? I will not exaggerate the matter, though I confess myself to be somewhat angry; the thing speaketh for itself. Let us pass to the second, which is no less notoriously untrue than this.

21. In the second point, as you have heard, he affirmeth, not only this of Socrates to be a known lie, but also that both Plato and all that have written of the death of Socrates do reprove this matter as a lie. But as for Plato, you have heard now out of himself the quite contrary: and of so many others as have written of his life

* Euseb. l. 7, c. 4.

† Lactan. l. 3, De Falsa Sapientia, num. 19.

‡ Augüst. l. De Vera Relig. cap. 2.

one hath been alleged by Mr. Sutcliffe for
whereas you have seen so many and evident
the affirmative. What shall we say, then, of
and shameless manner of dealing, in deny-
ing any thing, without respect of truth, pro-
credit at all? Will any man trust or esteem
what he saith hereafter?

22. And as for the second of these two Sixth charge,
about Zeno.
charges, about Zeno's speech of one God, or
no God, it is of small consideration to our purpose; but
only that in this also I find Mr. Sutcliffe to have evidently
falsified Father Persons's words; for thus he relateth them:
Plato (saith Persons) was wont to report of Zeno the Stoic,
that he should say, that either there was one God or no God.
But Father Persons's words are, that the said *Zeno the*
Stoic was wont to say, as Aristotle reporteth, that either
*one God or no God.** So as that which Father Persons
relateth, as reported by Aristotle, Mr. Sutcliffe maketh
him to say that it was out of Plato, who was Aristotle's
master; and then goeth he about to refute the matter, for
that Zeno lived after Plato; which being understood of
Zeno Cittieus, is true, but yet so as, if the observation of
Genebrard † be good, that he began his sect of Stoics, as
also Epicurus his opposite sect of Epicures, but twenty-six
years after the death of Alexander the Great; then might
Aristotle well live to know him, for that it is recorded that
this Zeno was familiar with Aristotle's chief scholar, Theo-
phrastus, in the school of Crates, whose hearer Zeno was,
as is manifest by Laertius, in the life of all these philoso-
phers. ‡ And furthermore, that this Zeno Cittieus, called
otherwise the Stoic, held the very same doctrine about the
being of one God and one eternal providence, Lactantius §
proveth at large, in his book *De Ira Dei: Unum esse na-*
turalem Deum (saith he), *dixit Antisthenes: eadem ferè*
Aristoteles cum suis Peripateticis, et Zeno cum suis Stoi-
cis—"Antisthenes saith that there is one only natural
God; and almost the very same saith Aristotle with

* Directory, part 1, c. 2, p. 42.

† Genebr. l. 2 Chron. A. M. 3797.

‡ Diog. Laert. in Vitis Aristotelis, Theophr., Cratis, et Zenonis.

§ Lactant. l. De Ira Dei, cap. 11.

his Peripatetics, and Zeno with his Stoics." So Lactantius.

23. But in truth I think there was some mistaking in the name of one Zeno for another; for that Aristotle's report seemeth to concern expressly the other more ancient Zeno, surnamed Eleates, for of him he writeth a special treatise in his third tome of Philosophy,* where he hath the sentence itself cited by Father Persons in his "Directory," about the necessary being of one God: *Si est, et talis est Deus, unum ipsum solum esse necesse est, neque enim aliter omnia posset quæcumque velit*—"If there be a God, and such a God as we have described to be omnipotent, of necessity he must be but one; for that otherwise he should not be able to do whatsoever he would." And this of Zeno the elder. And he that will see more authorities to this effect, let him read but the pages of Father Persons's "Directory," above mentioned, and he shall find all the chief of every sort and sect of philosophers alleged as confessing this verity of one God.

24. But what, now, doth Mr. Sutcliffe infer and conclude of all this? Let us hear his words. *Certes* (saith he) *these lies being the grounds of Persons's proofs, where he goeth about to shew that there is a God, are rather like to make a Gentile or heathen man obstinate, than to make him believe in one God.* In which words, first, I find it a great boldness, in my opinion, so resolutely to affirm for lies those things which have been so apparently proved; secondly, I do not find it true that these opinions of philosophers are alleged by Father Persons as grounds of his proofs that there is one God, understanding thereby, as it seemeth Mr. Sutcliffe would have it understood, that they are either his only or chiefest grounds. For he that shall read the treatise itself, in the "Directory," shall find that, albeit Father Persons (following herein, as hath been

All philosophers, by light of reason, came to know that there was but one God.

said, the example of many ancient fathers before named) do bring this argument, among many others, that all ancient philosophers, commonly, besides the Epicures or Atheists, did by light of reason come to know that there

* Arist. de Zenophon., Zenon., et Gorgia, tom. iii. p. 503.

was a God, and one God only; yet these are neither his only nor chief grounds: but he layeth down, in the place quoted, many other more strong theological proofs and demonstrations to convince the same; which are such, and so evident, so forcible, and effectual, as they may not only move, but constrain also, in reason, any heathen to believe that there is one only God; wherein, and for poof hereof, I remit me to him that shall read the said book of "Resolution." And so much for these two charges about philosophers, and Mr. Sutcliffe's injurious inference thereupon.

25. Next, then, ensueth, in the same chapter of forgeries and lies, this other charge of Mr. Sutcliffe: *Persons telleth us (saith he) that the number of infants slain at Bethlehem was fourteen thousand; and this he goeth about to prove by the Greek Calendar and the Liturgy of the Ethiopians: but such fables as he bringeth do rather discredit Christian religion than prove it. We believe that Herod killed the young children in Bethlehem and thereabouts; but so many as fourteen thousand could not be found in that quarter, as is very likely.** This is the charge; and truly, if all art of cavilling and calumniation were lost, it might be found again in this one example; for neither doth Father Persons affirm that the infants slain were just fourteen thousand, nor doth he *go about to prove it* as this man saith; nor is this his purpose in the place by Mr. Sutcliffe cited in the "Directory," as every child may see by viewing the place itself. For that Father Persons, in that chapter entitled "Of Proofs of Christianity," speaking of the death of these infants slain in Bethlehem, allegeth divers effectual and evident reasons why the relation of St. Matthew in that matter must needs be true; concluding in these words: *And finally he sheweth (to wit, the Evangelist St. Matthew) the most pitiful murder that ensued (after the departure of the Magi) of almost infinite† in-*

Seventh
charge, about
the infants
slain in Beth-
lehem.

* Sutcliffe, p. 205.

† Fourteen thousand, as saith the Liturgy of the Ethiopians and Calendar of the Greeks. [Scripture and the ancient fathers are silent on the number. Nothing can be avouched as certain on the subject; but a variety of circum-

*fants, in all the circuit of Bethlehem, for this matter; which could not be a thing unknown to all Jewry, much less feigned by St. Matthew; for that he should have given his adversaries the greatest advantage in the world, if he had begun his Gospel with so notorious and open an untruth, which might have been refuted by infinite persons that were alive.**

26. These are Father Persons's words; wherein you do not see any thing spoken at all of the said precise number, nor doth he go about to prove it, but only noteth in the margin (as you see) that such an opinion there was and is amongst the Grecian and Ethiopian Christians. His endeavour, therefore, was only to prove that this story of the Evangelist's is most certain, and that, for many reasons, it could not be feigned. But the certainty of the number of such as were slain appertained not to his purpose to affirm or deny; and how, then, or with what show of reason, doth Mr. Sutcliffe charge him in this behalf, for a note only made in the margin, of what is found in the Liturgy and Calendar of the Ethiopians and Grecians? Doth not this shew a great appetite of impertinent quarrelling, to leave the text and hunt so idly in the margin? Doth it not prove that he could find little substantial matter to object, when he runneth after such trifles?

27. But Mr. Sutcliffe saith that he and his do believe that Herod killed the young children in Bethlehem and thereabouts; but so many is not probable. Whereto I answer, first, that this toucheth Father Persons nothing at all, who neither affirmeth nor denieth any thing, as had been said, of the certain number, but only setteth down a note in the margin, as he found it registered by others. Secondly, that this number might be great in those days, and not so small as Mr. Sutcliffe seemeth to suppose, may be imagined by divers circumstances; as that Bethlehem was the head town or city of the tribe of Judah, whither, not long before, there was general recourse made of all

stances lead one to regard the statement of the Calendar of the Greeks as incredible.—Cardinal Gotti, *De Verâ Relig.* i. 348. See also *De la Hogue, De Verâ Relig.*]

* Directory, p. 174.

the said tribe of Judah, for professing their names, not only of men, but also of women, though great with child, as may be seen by the repair thither of the Blessed Virgin; that the whole country at that time was so populous, as by the testimony of Josephus,* the Jewish historiographer, then living, there were very many cities so exceedingly peopled, as that they comprehended above fifteen thousand inhabitants. Whereunto we may add these other considerations; that the slaughter was made by Herod's soldiers, set in fury by the jealousy their master had to lose his kingdom; their commission was, to kill all the children that were in Bethlehem and in all her confines, from two years old and downward; and how far they might extend those confines, no man can tell—Jerusalem itself was but six miles off. And we read it recorded by Macrobius, a heathen author, that one of Herod's own children was slain upon this commission.† We read also, in a relation of St. Peter the Martyr, Bishop of Alexandria, which relation was received in an ancient general council,‡ that St. John Baptist hardly escaped, by the flight of his mother, though his father's house, being in the mountains of Judea, was many miles from Bethlehem. Those words also of the prophet Jeremiah, § *Vox audita est in Rama*—"A cry is heard in Rama," whether we understand by Rama a city of Benjamin, whereof the books both of the Judges and Kings || do make often mention, or of Rama, a town in Arabia, as St. Justin the Martyr ¶ doth understand it, all doth prove that the cry reached far.

28. But the most important circumstance of enlarging this cruelty may be supposed to have been the liberty left to the ravenous soldiers, to judge not only of the confines,

* Josephus, l. 3, c. 2.

† Macrobius, l. 2, Saturnal. cap. 4. [Inter pueros quos Herodes intra biennium jussit occidi, *filium* quoque ejus occisum esse.—Walsingham has followed Baronius's interpretation of the passage, which, however, is untenable.—See Gotti, i. 349.]

‡ Petr. Alex. Can. 3, in Synod. 6, c. 1, apud Theod. Balsam, [a very doubtful authority].

§ Jerem. xxxi.

|| Judic. xix.; 3 Reg. xv.

¶ Justin. Dialog. de Veritate, cum Tryphone.

as hath been said, but also of the age of two years and downward. For as under that age they had charge to kill all, yea, though never so newly born; the words of their commission being to slaughter *omnes pueros in omnibus finibus à bimatu et infrà*—"all children in all the confines, from two years old and under:" so had they no penalty or punishment appointed, if they killed others that were above that age. And the examen thereof being to be made, not by orderly way of judgment, but by martial law, and by the pleasure and arbitrement of them that were already imbrued in blood, and had their naked swords ready drawn to prosecute the massacre; a man may easily imagine what havoc they would make, and how great the number might be of them that were slain, and made away in that so universal, cruel, and barbarous murder. And this may be replied to Mr. Sutcliffe's negative conjectural, that so many as fourteen thousand are not likely.

The eighth charge, about the first Christians in Alexandria.

29. Now then shall we pass to the last of Mr. Sutcliffe's accusations against Father Persons, in this his book of "Defence of his Challenge,"* which he proposeth in these words: "Persons saith, p. 269, of his 'Directory,' that Philo, the Jew, doth set forth strange things in the life and exercises of St. Mark, and of his disciples that lived in Alexandria: but if Philo, in his book there mentioned, *de Vita Contemplativa*, do neither speak of St. Mark nor his disciples in Alexandria, I hope that Persons's disciples will be ashamed of their master's ignorance, and confess that he hath lied." So Mr. Dean. And truly I could wish that I were able in this place to excuse him only with the note of ignorance, which he objecteth to his adversary in treating this passage of St. Mark and Philo, without condemning him of a far greater fault. For besides the said ignorance in denying a matter so notoriously avouched by so many ancient authors, as now we shall touch; it seemeth to involve also lack of Christian piety in detracting from the due praises of that primitive church and prime Christian plants, whose lives were so admirable in Alexandria of Egypt, in those first days and years of their

* Sutcliffe, p. 205.

conversion; as Philo, though a Jew in religion, yet in his books of *contemplative life*, doth with admiration make mention of what he had seen, heard, or observed among them. And albeit he doth not expressly name either St. Mark or Christians, but rather describeth the excellency of their life and conversation under the name of *Essæans*, or holy men (for so St. Chrysostom doth interpret the word to signify);* yet both St. Jerome, in divers places of his works, as also Eusebius, St. Epiphanius, Cassianus, and other ancient writers, do expressly testify, that Philo meant those praises of singular holiness of life, and especially of continency and voluntary poverty, to be of the Jews, his countrymen, that were converted first to Christianity in the city of Alexandria, and confines thereof, by St. Mark, sent thither from Rome by St. Peter, the apostle, to found that church. St. Jerome's words are these: *Constituit (St. Marcus) Ecclesiam tanta doctrinæ et vitæ continentia*, &c.†—"St. Mark did institute the Church (of Alexandria) with so great continency both of learning and life, as he did force all followers of Christ to imitate his example. And Philo, the most eloquent (writer) among the Jews, seeing the first church of Alexandria as yet observing some Jewish rites, he wrote, as it were in the praise of his own nation, a book concerning their life and conversation; wherein, as St. Luke declareth in the Acts of the Apostles that the faithful at Jerusalem had all things common: so this man left in writing that which he had seen at Alexandria to be practised under St. Mark, their instructor."

St. Jerome's testimony of the first Christians in Alexandria.

30. Thus far are these words of St. Jerome, in the life of St. Mark; and when he cometh to mention the life of Philo, among other ecclesiastical writers, he saith, that the reason why he placeth him in that rank (though no Christian) was, *Quia librum de prima Marci Evangelistæ apud Alexandriam scribens Ecclesia, in nostrorum laude versatus est*—"For that he, writing a book of the first church planted

* Chrysost. hom. 44, in Act.

† Hieron. De Script. Ecclesiast. in Marco.

by St. Mark the Evangelist, at Alexandria, writeth much in the praise of us Christians: relating that there were many Christians, not only there, but in many other provinces also, whose habitations he calleth *monasteries*, and sheweth (saith St. Jerome) that first church of them that believed in Christ, to be of such men as now desire and endeavour to be monks. So as no man had any thing in proper, no man was rich, no man was poor, every man's patrimony was divided among such as were poor, all attended to prayer, &c." So St. Jerome; with whom agreeth St. Epiphanius,* and before him again, Eusebius; that Philo's descriptions of the austerity of life in those *Essæans* was meant of those first Christians. And the like hath Cassianus, that lived in the time of St. Augustine. Sozomen, also, and Cedrenus, Nicephorus, Bede, and others, which were too long to recite, and being a matter so merely concerning the praise of St. Mark the Evangelist, and his first church, and the singular graces of our Saviour that so fructified and beautified the same, and being testified by consent of so many ancient writers as now we have seen, I could not but marvel with what spirit Mr. Sutcliffe should contradict the same: especially forso much as he addeth so confidently these words, *that he hopeth by this that Persons's disciples will be ashamed of their master's ignorance, and confess that he hath lied*. Whereas I see not how Mr. Sutcliffe's best friends (if he have not disciples) can avoid to blush for him, seeing him so taken in the manner as here he is, and hath been so oftentimes before, without being able to convince Father Persons of any one lie, or wilful untruth, which hitherto I could find in all that he hath objected against him.

31. And yet doth he conclude all these charges against Father Persons, with this triumphant and contumelious assertion: *It were an easy matter* (saith he) *to set down infinite lies of this lying companion, who without lying is not able to speak any thing; but when he hath cleared him-*

* Epiph. Hæres. 29; Euseb. l. 2, Hist. cap. 15 et 16; Cassianus, l. 2, De Institut. Cœnobiorum, c. 5; Sozom. l. 1, Hist. c. 12, in fine; Niceph. l. 4, c. 15; Beda in præfat. ad Marcum.

*self of these, he shall have twice as many more objected against him.** This is his threat, and I do easily believe, that he can frame many multitudes of untruths to be objected, but how he will prove them, there is the difficulty.

For hitherto, as hath been said, in these that have been objected, I do not find so much as one that may truly be called a wilful untruth, except it be in the objector himself. And in these sixteen which here I have

examined, taking them without choice as they lie in the beginning and end of his catalogue, I find that every lie objected by him is two or three times returned and multiplied upon him-

The disastrous success of Mr. Sutcliffe in objecting lies, and not being able to prove them.

self: so as in objecting these sixteen, he is convinced to have committed twice sixteen at least, which seems inexcusable on his behalf. How many, then, may you imagine might be returned upon him, if I would here stand to examine and set down all the rest of the sixty-two, which here he hath heaped together? whereof notwithstanding you shall have more experience in the two sequent chapters, which I have allotted to his objections gathered by him against the same man in other two of his books,

* Sutcliffe, p. 206.

CHAPTER VI.

The Examination of other Untruths objected against Father Persons, by Mr. Sutcliffe, in his Book, entitled, "A full and round Answer to the Warn-word," containing, as Mr. Sutcliffe's words are, "A List of Lies, Falsities, Fooleries, Impieties, and other enormous Faults and Abuses."

HITHERTO, as you have heard, Mr. Sutcliffe's battery hath been principally against three books of Father Persons, to wit, "The Reasons of Refusal," "The Christian Directory," and "The Ward-word:" now he taketh a fourth book in hand, named "The Warn-word," which he oppugneth by a treatise entitled, "A full and round Answer," wherein I think best to let pass how little I found in the perusal thereof that may be accounted worthy the name of "A full Answer." For as for *round*, it is like he meaneth thereby his foresaid scolding, which is round and rough indeed, passing all reason, modesty, and urbanity for the most part, and unfit, in my opinion, to proceed from the pen of any learned or civil man whatsoever. But as for the fulness of satisfaction given therein, I found it not at all; but rather the principal matters handled in the said book of "Warn-word" (which, being of moment, I desired to see well discussed), so shuffled, dissembled, disguised, inverted, or wholly pretermitted in this *full Answer*, as I could hardly find any one thing probably answered, either in due place or out of place. But now, leaving aside the bulk of the book, I will only examine some part of his foresaid list of *lies, falsities, fooleries, and impieties* (as he styleth them), and shall begin with the last of the foresaid four enormous faults (to wit, impiety), even as Mr. Sutcliffe himself doth, who entitleth

a special chapter in this his book, *Of the Impiety and Atheism of Robert Persons, &c.*; which seeming to me a most grievous and most heinous charge to be put in print without great ground for proof thereof, I persuaded myself that we should see both pregnant and substantial proofs and evidences for the same.

2. First, then, his first proof is framed thus: *William Watson** (saith he), *a famous fellow in his "Quodlibets," calleth him a beast, devil, and a monopoly of mischief.*† But here I could not but marvel at Mr. Sutcliffe's conscience and respect of his credit, having seen or heard so lately before the strange end of the witness he produceth, and how at his death by public justice he was sorry, and sore repented, and asked pardon also of these his passionate writings, would notwithstanding bring the same forth in the very first front of his accusations, this book of his being written divers months after the other's death, as appeared by the First accusation, about Atheism. year in which it was published,‡ and the other put to death: and it seemeth indeed that his own conscience did reprehend him, for that he addeth presently these words: *But if any man doubt of it, then these ensuing testimonies out of his "Warn-word," against which we dispute, may assure him.* Well, then, we shall examine some of these testimonies as they lie in this his list, and see whether they have any more substance in them than the former, to prove Father Persons an Atheist.

3. "The Holy Scriptures (saith he) do everywhere use this word *minister of Christ*, or *minister of the Gospel*, in good part, as Rom. xv., 1 Cor. iii., and elsewhere; and is he not then an impious fellow and a slave of Satan, that everywhere useth this word in scorn and contempt, saying *Sir minister, The minister, Insolent minister*, and the like?"§ But this charge seemed unto me more weak and inconsiderate than the former, yea, fraudulent also, and unsincere, for that he Second accusation, about the name of minister.

* [A missionary priest, executed at Winchester, Nov. 29, 1603, for Treason.—See Tierney's *Dodd*. iv. 6, et seq.]

† Sutcl. in his full and round Answer, p. 254; Quodlib. 8, art. 5.

‡ An. 1604.

§ Sutcliffe, p. 154.

maketh his adversary to speak contemptuously of the minister of Christ and of the Gospel; whereas he hath no such thing, either in word or meaning, that I can find. For if he had said so, or meant so of true ministers of Christ and the Gospel, or had held Mr. Sutcliffe for such a one, is it likely he would have used his person and ministry with more respect?

4. But now, on the other side, it is found quite contrary to Mr. Sutcliffe's assertion, that the word *minister* may signify, not only good, but also wicked ministers, yea, the very ministers of Satan himself, as St. Paul sheweth evidently in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, saying: *Non est magnum, si ministri ejus* (Satanæ) *transfigurentur, veluti ministri justitiæ**—"It is no great marvel if the ministers of (Satan) do transfigure themselves, as if they were the ministers of justice:" and this he speaketh of Christian ministers, yea, of such as call themselves *evangelical* and *apostolical* ministers, nay, very true and sincere apostles of Jesus Christ, as there St. Paul declareth, though indeed they were heretics, and, as he termeth them, *operarii subdoli*—"subtile workmen," whereof, it may be, Father Persons, in his opinion, took Mr. Sutcliffe for one. And again, to speak of other ministers, St. John writeth, that *ministri Judæorum comprehenderunt Jesum et ligaverunt*—"the ministers of the Jews did apprehend and bind Jesus."† These, then, were no very good ministers. And, in the same chapter:‡ *Unus ministrorum dedit alapam Jesu*—"One of the ministers gave a blow to Jesus." This was an insolent minister. And yet further, in St. Mark's Gospel, it is said—"Ministri alapis eum cedebant"—"The ministers did buffet Christ with their fists."§ These were wicked ministers. And, moreover, in the same Gospel: *Pontifices et ministri clamabant, Crucifige, crucifige*—"The high priests and ministers did cry out, 'Crucify him, crucify him;'"|| which was the voice of cruel and bloody ministers. So as always in Scripture the name and office of *minister* (though pretending to be of Christ or of his Gospel) is not taken in

* 2 Cor. xi. 14.

† John xviii. 12.

‡ John xviii. 22.

§ Cap. xiv. 65.

|| John xix. 6.

good part, as Mr. Sutcliffe avoucheth. And it was no doubt a great oversight in him to affirm it, except he will deny all these places alleged to be Scripture. Neither can he avoid the oversight by saying that the later places do mean of *Jewish* ministers, for that the first out of St. Paul about ministers of Satan doth treat expressly of such as named themselves *Christian* ministers, as hath been said, but yet were not, but very bad ones. And for that cause no man, I think, will deny but a man might have said to one of these ministers, without crime of atheism, *Sir minister, False minister, Insolent minister*, and the like. And it is very probable that Father Persons, considering the difference of his religion from Mr. Sutcliffe, did in his opinion hold him rather for one of the same or like rank of ministers, than for either true minister of Christ or his Gospel; and consequently I do not see how it may be imputed to him for atheism, for saying to Mr. Sutcliffe, *Sir minister, False minister, Insolent minister*, or the like. And so much for this charge.

5. His third demonstration, then, to prove Father Persons an Atheist is, for that he, in his "Warn-word," answering to Mr. Sutcliffe's Challenge and demand to have Father Cresswell enter into combat with him, said, *Nescis quid petis*—"You know not what you ask, for Cresswell would crush you;" which Mr. Sutcliffe argueth for a point of atheism, for alluding therein to the words of Christ, in St. Matthew's Gospel, *Nescitis quid petatis*, to the two sons of Zebedæus; complaining greatly that Father Persons therein did seem to compare himself to Christ, and him only to Zebedæus's sons. But this objection appeareth to be so silly and insufficient to prove so great and heinous a charge as atheism is, that it seemeth to me to deserve rather the laughter of the reader, and commiseration of Mr. Sutcliffe, than any other answer, especially that he disdaineth to be compared to the two sons of Zebedæus, James and John, who were great apostles. And it may be presumed that Father Persons never had intention to compare him to so great and worthy men, and much less himself to Christ.

Third accusation, about nescis quid petis.

6. His fourth charge of atheism is set down by him in these words: "He objecteth preaching unto me, and in great reproach calleth me a preaching dean, yet the apostle to the Romans teacheth us that preaching is the means to reveal the Gospel, and to bring men to Christ. It is no marvel, therefore, if these limbs of Antichrist do hate preaching, by which men are brought from Antichrist to Christ." So he; but this is so poor a charge, as I wondered exceedingly what he meant to allege it; for suppose all were true that Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth, how doth this argue atheism? or that Father Persons hateth preaching? For that he will distinguish of preaching, good or bad, true or false, as we distinguished before of ministers, rejecting the one and admitting the other; and with this is the charge overturned, though it were truly made upon Father Persons's words.

7. For now, when I went to Father Persons's book, I found that *all is false* that is objected; for that he doth not exprobrate preaching reproachfully unto Mr. Sutcliffe, but rather speaketh thereof to his credit; for whereas Mr. Sutcliffe excuseth himself for scurrilous speech in writing, saying first, as the "Warn-word" recounteth, *because it is no fault to write as I have done*; and then again; *and were it a fault, yet I trust thou wilt bear with my weakness, seeing, as the apostle saith, all of us offend in many things*: to all these excuses and evasions the said "Warn-word" answereth thus: "Here, lo! is the last refuge and excuse of all, to wit, *by weakness*, and that *all do offend in many things*. To the first, if it be weakness of brain and wit, it is pardonable, for that it is forcible; but if it be weakness in manners or honesty (to use such lying and scurrility), it is a foul fault in a prelate and preaching dean, that should instruct and strengthen others."* This is so much as the "Warn-word" hath in that place, and what atheism is this? What hatred or reproach of preaching? nay, Mr. Sutcliffe, in my opinion, is honoured by being called a *prelate and preaching dean*. How then may a man think

* Warn-word, fol. 21.

that he hath any thing of moment to object against Father Persons when he bringeth forth such childish trifles, and those also falsified?

8. His fifth argument, then, to prove Father Persons an Atheist is set down in these words:

Fifth accusation, about naming a prophet.

*He jesteth at Sir Francis Hastings, and saith he doth imitate the spirit of some hidden prophet: but what is more impious than to use the name of a prophet and of God's Holy Spirit to make up a jest?**

Whereunto may be answered, that there be many things more impious than to name a false prophet, or hidden spirit, in jest or in earnest. Neither is it likely that Father Persons meant Sir Francis Hastings to be a true prophet, nor his spirit of invectives against the Catholics to be God's Spirit; besides that he doth not say absolutely, as here is alleged, *he doth imitate the spirit of some hidden prophet*, but thus: *he thinking to imitate perhaps herein the spirit of some hidden prophet*,† to wit, in forewarning England to beware of the increase of Catholics. So as I neither find truth in setting down of any thing, nor force of inference if it were true. For what maketh all this to prove atheism? Did not Christ say, *Beware of false prophets*?‡ Nay, doth not Mr. Sutcliffe himself, in the very first page of his "Reply against the 'Warn-word,'" set down this sentence or poesy out of Deuteronomy, that *a prophet or dreamer of dreams shall be slain*?§ Of these prophets then a man might speak or jest, I trow, without the crime of atheism or impiety; therefore, it seemeth that Mr. Sutcliffe was in a dream when he gave so weak a charge upon his adversary in so weighty a cause.

9. His sixth charge of atheism is thus set down: *He professeth (saith he) to handle controversies of religion, and yet he calleth his*

Sixth accusation, about naming an interlude.

dispute an interlude; what then may we think of this counterfeit Christian?|| whereunto may be answered, that atheism is a great crime to be inferred upon so small a charge, especially if we consider the speech of the

* Sutcliffe, p. 255.

† Warn-word, fol. 22.

‡ Matt. vii.

§ Deuteron. xiii.

|| Mr. Sutcliffe's Reply, anno 1600, p. 155.

"Warn-word," who, having answered Sir Francis about so much as he brought for himself, and seeing afterward a new book, coming forth from Mr. Sutcliffe, under the name of O. E. (in supply, as it were, of the knight's weakness), he hath these words: "We must see what the minister, O. E., bringeth after the knight, whose book came to my hand when this was written, and I have promised to give him a place also in the interlude, when his turn cometh." * Where we see, that the word *interlude* doth not signify a comedy, as Mr. Sutcliffe enforceth it, saying *that now this mass priest is become a comedian*, but only a colloquy or mutual speech between different persons; nor doth the "Warn-word" in this point speak of controversies in religion, but of the agreeing or rather disagreeing of Sir Francis and Mr. Sutcliffe, in defending themselves against the former book of "Ward-word."

10. And thus have I spent some more lines than are worth the labour, or than I had purposed at the beginning, to shew by these six examples, as they lie in order, what substantial matter Mr. Sutcliffe urgeth against Father Persons to convince him of impiety and atheism, which indeed made me ashamed to read them over, and half-ashamed I am to have set them down, but that by these a man may guess at the rest, as also at the man's vein in objecting any thing that cometh into his pen's end, whether it be to the purpose or not; as in this very same fourth chapter† of impieties and atheism he objecteth many other arguments of atheism as vain as the precedent; and, namely, for that Father Persons defendeth with Dr.

Seventh accusation, about Ostiensis and Panormitan.

Panormitan the saying of Ostiensis, "that Christ and his substitute upon earth, the Bishop of Rome, have but one consistory or tribunal:" as if a man would say, that a king and his deputy have the selfsame judgment-seat; what atheism were this? He objecteth the like impiety for defending Bishop

Eighth accusation, about Bishop Steuchus.

Steuchus,‡ who affirmeth Constantine the Emperor to have called the Bishop of Rome, that lived in his days, God, in the same sense that

* Warn-word, p. 33.

† Ibid. p. 29.

‡ Ibid. p. 28.

Moses and other holy men in the Scriptures are sometimes so called; what atheism also is there in this, to relate that which one man writeth of another?

11. The like charge of atheism he maketh against Father Persons for approving* the words of Cardinal Cusanus, who saith that *mutato judicio ecclesiæ, mutatum est et Dei judicium*—"the judgment of the church being changed (about any matter appertaining to her jurisdiction here upon earth for binding or loosing of sins), God's judgment changeth in like manner;" for proof whereof he allegeth not only scriptures, as the words of Christ, in St. Matthew's Gospel (*Whatsoever you remit or retain on earth, shall be remitted or retained in heaven*), but large discourses also to prove the same out of St. Chrysostom, St. Hilary, and St. Bernard,† which Mr. Sutcliffe concealing, and not so much as endeavouring to answer, accuseth Father Persons of atheism for holding the same with them.‡

Ninth accusation, about Cusanus.

12. And the like crime he objecteth unto him for holding Trinitarians for heretics. *He placeth* (saith he) *Trinitarians among heretics, as if it were heresy to believe the Holy Trinity*. But this is a notable calumny, for that Father Persons doth not count them for heretics, because they *believed* the Blessed Trinity, but rather for that they *denied* the same. And this must Mr. Sutcliffe needs know, if he have read his book, for his words are these: § *From Zuinglius departed Calvin and Beza, and from these again into another faction, Michael Servetus, John Calvin's colleague in times past, whom he afterward caused to be burned in Geneva, for denying the Blessed Trinity, and Valentinus Gentilis, a new Arian: and with these joined Joannes Paulus Alcianus, Gribaldus, and others, which made afterwards the new sect of Arians and Trinitarians that yet remain in Germany and Poland, and especially in Transylvania, as their books do shew*. So far the "Warn-word." And now let any man judge whether Father Persons doth place Trinitarians

Tenth accusation, about Trinitarians.

* Warn-word, p. 45.

† Chrysost. l. 2, De Sacerd.; Hilar. in cap. 16, Matth. [terrestre judicium præjudicata auctoritas in coelo]. Bern. l. 2, De Consider. c. 2.

‡ Sutcliffe, p. 256.

§ Warn-word, p. 45, no. 9.

among heretics for that they *believed* the Holy Trinity, or rather for that they *denied* the same; and let the reader marvel with me at Mr. Sutcliffe's manner of proceeding in this behalf.

13. And thus much out of this chapter of impieties and atheism objected to Father Persons. There ensue divers other chapters by him framed under sundry other titles, as of *ridiculous and childish errors, of singular patcheries and fooleries, allegations against himself, immodest railings, vain clamours, and idle objections, poor shifts and fond evasions, patchery in begging things that are in controversy, flattery and lying, foul falsifications*, and other such accusations of divers sorts, every thing being brought to several chapters, squadrons, and ranks to make up a great number of impugnations, with this title over all the pages, "A list of Robert Persons's Lies, Fooleries, and other Abuses, &c." Wherein he speaketh a third part of his whole book of *Full and Round Answer*: but when I saw him descend to such poor examples as you have heard, and that he ac-

Erring beha-
viour of Mr.
Sutcliffe.

cuseth him seriously for not understanding Latin, for that in one place, by error of the print, is found *qui parcè seminit*, for *parcè seminat*, and, in another, *Massilians* for *Messulians*, I was out of heart to go further in, especially finding that, in objecting also these trifles, himself was not ashamed to use divers frauds and manifest calumniations, for that going about to upbraid him with the like error to the last named, of using solecism in recital of St. Bede's words, he saith thus:—

14. *In his second encounter, cap. 3, he committeth a gross solecism in reciting Bede's words; where he saith scientiam servatur et confitetur, he should have said scientiam scrutatur et confitetur, but that his spectacles failed him (saith he), having forgotten his grammar.** But it seemeth that Mr. Sutcliffe upon passion forgot himself here; first, to ascribe unto the author that which he must of necessity evidently see and perceive to be the fault of the printer, and then, in shewing *malam fidem*, lack of conscience in himself; for that Father Persons, in the place here quoted, alleging the words of St. Bede, *hæc insula quinque gen-*

* Sutcliffe, p. 266.

tium linguarum eandemque summæ veritatis scientiam scrutatur et confitetur, the printer, by error, set down *servatur* for *scrutatur*. But the English translation that ensueth immediately could not but force Mr. Sutcliffe to see that the fault was not in the author (to wit, Father Persons), for want either of *grammar* or of his *spectacles*; for thus he translateth it:—*This Island* (of Britany) *at this present doth in five tongues search out and confess one and the selfsame knowledge of the highest truth, &c.** So as the author, translating *scrutatur*, by the word *search out*, doth evidently shew, that his copy had *scrutatur*, and not *servatur*, which hath no sense at all: whereof ensueth that Mr. Sutcliffe did wilfully, against his own knowledge, untruly accuse Father Persons, in this place, of solecism; which lack of truth and conscience having once found out in him, or rather so often as you have heard, and will more hereafter, I confess that I fell to suspect every thing that he writeth or affirmeth until I had examined it.

Notable falsehood, in objecting solecism.

15. He adjoineth also in the same place another charge against Father Persons, saying: *He distinguisheth the doctrine of ὁμῳσιον and Consubstantiality as two several points of Christian religion, whereas the learned know that ὁμῳσιον, in Greek, is nothing but consubstantial.* But when I went to read the place, I found this charge to be a mere calumny: for that Father Persons, in the place cited, allegeth three words—ὁμῳσιον, *Trinity*, and *Consubstantiality*,† as all of one doctrine, importing the selfsame thing, as is plain by his words and whole discourse. And I wondered that Mr. Sutcliffe would object this against him, but that now I began to wonder at nothing of Mr. Sutcliffe in that kind.

Exceeding accusation, about ὁμῳσιον.

16. From this I passed over to two or three other chapters, entitled of like argument against the same author; and of the selfsame substance in moment of truth with the former, as will appear to him that will examine the same as I did, but have not now time to set down here the

* Warn-word, Enc. 2, c. 3, fol. 14 a.

† Ibid. Enc. 2, fol. 114.

Mr. Sutcliffe's ^{bad dealing} ^{with his adver-} ^{sary.} tenth part, for that it would require a several great volume to lay forth the whole, he striving everywhere to cast forth objections in great heaps to the show; and for more increase of number, he objecteth the selfsame thing again and again, under divers heads and common-places which he maketh to himself, and commonly they are but bare negations or assertions of his own, shortly and obscurely cast forth against his adversary without proof; and commonly I find some kind of falsity by him used in every one, either by the figure of *reticentia*, concealing that which would make all plain, or by perverting his adversary's words or sense, or by denying that which is evidently in the text, or objecting that which is of no force, if it be granted, and other such sleights, whereof you have heard divers examples, and shall have more hereafter. For now from these triflings we shall pass to the chief chapter of all, in this his book, if any may be called chief, which is entitled "*Of principal Lies uttered by Robert Persons,*" out of which we shall examine some dozen passages, or thereabout, taken as they lie in his book, without choice or election.

THE SECOND PART OF THIS CHAPTER,

Containing sundry other Objections made by Mr. Sutcliffe against Father Persons, as more peculiar to his purpose; which therefore he called principal Lies.

17. THERE followeth then Mr. Sutcliffe's ninth chapter of objections, which is a long one, being of above a dozen leaves, bearing this title, "A Catalogue of certain principal Lies uttered by Robert Persons, in his late 'Warnword.'" And here I thought to find principal matter indeed, as reserved to the chief and proper place of his whole subject of accusations: for that all the other chapters seemed to me, as hath been said, but impertinent digressions; but still I found Mr. Sutcliffe like himself, great promises and little performance.

18. For his first charge is this, and in these words: *In the front of his book* (quoth he), *he* ^{First charge, about breach of promise.} *promiseth the issue of three former treatises, and in the second page talketh of eight encounters; but he falsifieth his promise, and lieth grossly: for of the three former treatises he toucheth only two; and of eight encounters, entereth only upon two.** So he. But this seemed to me not to be a charge answering to a title of so principal lies, as even now he promised; for he that will look upon the first leaf of the "Warn-word" will find the falsification easy for this matter; for that the issue promised of the three treatises, to wit, the "Watch-word," the "Ward-word," and "Waste-word," (the first and last being treatises of Sir Francis's and Mr. Sutcliffe's), is in effect declared in the said "Warn-word" so far as the discourse goeth. And as for the eight encounters handled in the said "Ward-word," though they be mentioned in the second page also of the last treatise, named the "Warn-word," thereby to admonish again the reader of the whole controversy and argument thereof with Sir Francis and Mr. Sutcliffe; yet, in the very same page, the two last lines are these: *The first two encounters are handled only in this book, the others are to follow in other several books afterwards:* so as if Father Persons do expressly affirm that he meant to handle but two encounters in that last book of his, how doth Mr. Sutcliffe call it a lie? yea, a gross lie? Or how may it appertain to this his chapter of principal lies being so very a trifle, as you see, and false in itself?

19. His second charge he setteth down in these words, that Father Persons beginneth ^{Second charge, about a false alarm of invasion.} his epistle to the reader with a gross lie: saying, *There happened some years past* (he noteth the year 1599 in the margin), *as often also before, a certain false alarm of a Spanish invasion, then said* (by Sir Francis in his "Watch-word") *to be upon the seas towards England. Where I need not to note the idiotism of Persons's speech that talketh of a Spanish invasion upon the seas towards England, being elsewhere noted.†* So he. But surely it

* Sutcliffe, p. 291.

† Ibid.

seemed to me scarce worth the noting once, and much less divers times, but only for lack of better matter. Nor do I see why Mr. Sutcliffe should account any man an idiot for naming a *Spanish invasion upon the seas towards England*: forsomuch as if any invasion come from Spain towards England, it must needs come by sea, or else in the air: and I have read the same phrase of speech used by ancient writers, even in Mr. Sutcliffe's judgment, as, *in Africam navigabat bellum*, saith Florus:* but much less do I see how he should call this *so gross a lie* for Father Persons to call it a *false alarm*, forsomuch as no such invasion appeared afterwards, either by sea or land, as then was given forth.

Third charge,
Sir Francis
Hastings dis-
avowing his
"Watch-
word."

20. His third charge is, that Father Persons wrote in his epistle of the "Warn-word," *that the news was in most men's mouths, after the publication of the answer to the "Watch-word," that Sir Francis Hastings had disavowed the said "Watch-word," by attributing the same rather to certain ministers of his communion, that either wrote the same, or induced him thereunto.*† This is called by Mr. Sutcliffe not only a *lie*, but a *foul-mouthed lie*, and a *lie without show or probability*, though other proof than his own word he bring none. And indeed to prove a negative, that neither there was, or could be by any probability, any such speech in men's mouths, seemeth to me a very hard thing to be done; and consequently I see not how this assertion of Father Persons, not being yet improved,‡ may be accounted for so principal a lie as to enter into this rank, if he had store of other matter.

Fourth charge,
about Mr. Sut-
cliffe's supply
for Sir Fran-
cis.

21. The fourth charge is, that Father Persons affirmeth in his epistle prefixed before the "Warn-word,"§ that a certain minister (meaning Mr. Sutcliffe) wrote in supply of the knight's defence: but why this should be censured by Mr. Sutcliffe for so *great a lie*, I find not the reason. For, first, that such a supply is extant under the letters of O.E. (which since that time Mr. Sutcliffe hath confessed to sig-

* Lib. 2, De Gest. Rom. cap. 2.

† [i. e. disproved.]

† Mr. Sutcliffe, p. 295.

§ Ibid, p. 295.

nify himself), cannot be denied. And though it bear not the very name of a *supply*, yet in substance it is so: for that it endeavoureth to help out Sir Francis in most points of difficulty: and secondly, the two books of Sir Francis and Mr. Sutcliffe coming forth the one after the other, about the same subject and argument, Father Persons had probability, at least, to guess as he writeth. And howsoever it be, the charge is of small weight, as every reader of mean capacity will consider. Yet would I have you to observe one thing more, before I let this pass, which is that Mr. Sutcliffe maketh this demand presently upon his objection: *But how can Persons prove that I perused the knight's Answer, or once saw it?* Which is a strange demand, if it be well considered, for that in the first page and front of his book we writeth thus: "A brief Reply to a certain odious and slanderous Libel lately published against Sir Francis Hastings, &c., wherein not only the honest and religious intention and zeal of that good Knight is defended, but also the cause of true Catholic religion, and the justice of her Majesty, &c." This is the title of his book. But now, whether it be credible that Mr. Sutcliffe would take upon him to write and print a defence of Sir Francis's "Watch-word," without ever perusing or seeing the same, I leave to the discreet reader to consider. And truly, if it were the case of some man that esteemed much his own credit, he would, perhaps, rather suffer himself to be convinced of an ingenuous lie, in denying to have seen the said book, than to be condemned for so light a head, as to print a defence of a treatise that he never saw nor perused in his life; and one of these two must needs fall upon Mr. Sutcliffe—he may choose which he will: but let us pass on to the rest.

22. His fifth charge of lying against Father Persons runneth in these words: *In his observations (saith he) upon my preface, folio 11, he saith, my project and purpose of writing is to irritate, and stir up her Majesty, and her honourable council, with the rest that stand at the stern of government, to engulf themselves in Catholics' blood, and spoil of their*

Mr. Sutcliffe in
hard straits.

Fifth charge,
about Mr. Sut-
cliffe desiring
the blood of
Catholics.

goods, whereby I and my hungry crew might hope to come to have some share in the dividend, &c. But first, it is most false that Papists are Catholics: secondly, no one word can he allege out of my whole book whereby it may be gathered that I would have any rigour used against simple Papists, that are not factious or mutinous.* So Mr. Sutcliffe; which seemeth to me so implicate an objection, as it involveth himself much more than his adversary. For, first, who shall judge who be mere simple Papists, and who be factious and mutinous? For that in the very next charge ensuing he hath these words: *We scorn* (saith he) *that traitors that have war in their hearts should talk of peace, and that idolaters and heretics should talk and prate of religion.* And then throughout his whole book he hath this principle, *that all Papists are idolaters, and that all idolaters must be put to death:* for which, in the very first page of his book of "Reply to the 'Ward-word,'" he hath these sentences: *The prophet or dreamer of dreams shall be slain,* Deuteron. xiii. And again, *Beware of false prophets,* Matt. vii. And yet further, *Halter me these* Mr. Sutcliffe biting at Catho- lics. *wolves,* out of Zenodotus. And finally, *If you nourish up wolves and dogs, they will in the end devour or bite you,* out of Theocritus. Moreover, he holdeth everywhere that Papists are traitors, and that traitors are no ways to be suffered or tolerated: and all his book tendeth to this end, as may be seen by the foresaid first page.

23. And how then doth he charge Father Persons here with a lie, yea, *a principal lie*, for using the words before alleged, to wit, *that his project and purpose in writing was to irritate and stir up her Majesty and the council to engulf themselves in Catholics' blood?* If he professed this, I say, in the first front of his book, with what face can he deny it now, and accuse his adversary of lying for charging him with the same? Or how may I defend Mr. Sutcliffe from notorious lying, in that he saith here, *that no one word can be alleged out of his book to that end?* Is it possible that a man should be so forgetful or careless in his writing? Or maketh Mr. Sutcliffe no account at all

* Page 296.

of his credit, though not of his conscience? I confess that I am somewhat moved with grief to find myself so deceived by him in my expectation as I am, but yet will I examine one or two examples more, as in his book they ensue.

24. "In his observation (saith he) upon Sir Francis's Epistle, folio 6, Persons writeth thus: *Sir Francis objecteth that I seek the ruin of both church and commonwealth, by my exhortation to peace, atonement, and mitigation in religion, which afterward goeth in my Remitter to the Lords of her Majesty's Council, &c.* A notorious lie (saith Mr. Sutcliffe), *refuted by reading of Sir Francis's 'Apology,' where there is no one word sounding that way.*"* So he. But I repairing to the original itself of Sir Francis's book, I found the plain check of this in the very first page, where Sir Francis's words are these,† talking of the "Ward-word," which was entitled *Temperate: He proclaimeth temperance* (saith he) *in his title, but he pursueth the art of railing in the whole process following; and in the end of all he persuadeth ruin both to church and commonwealth.* And a few lines after, expounding his meaning more clearly, saith: *The end of Persons's book (the "Ward-word") sheweth his intention to be, to bring in either a toleration, or flat alteration of religion:* which words and sense being laid together, what may we think or say of Mr. Sutcliffe, that objecteth the rehearsal of the said words for a notorious lie to Father Persons? And further remitteth us (which is the most ridiculous of all) to the reading of Sir Francis's book, by which himself is convinced manifestly of the said lie; he avouching, moreover, *that there is no one word* (in Sir Francis's book) *sounding that way:* which I do not see how he could avouch with any safety of conscience at all, much less with such confidence as he doth, if it were true that he had never seen or perused the book, as immediately before he said, but with much less conscience if he had read and perused that book indeed, and had seen the foresaid words (by him de-

*Sixth charge,
about words of
Sir Francis.*

*Mr. Sutcliffe's
evil luck in ob-
jecting lies to
others.*

* Page 296.

† Sir Francis in the Epistle of his Apology, p. 1.

nied) evidently to be extant in the very first page thereof, as now hath been shewed. Upon consideration whereof, I was brought into such a muse with myself, as I can hardly express: for it seemeth strange and incredible to me, that a man of his calling and coat, in England, would in such disgraceful manner object untruths in print to others, as that almost in every charge to begin commonly with some notorious untruth of his own, and that afterwards the lie objected by him proving no lie against his adversary, it reboundeth so back upon himself as maketh him to remain guilty of both lies, and his adversary cleared of all.

25. And this shall suffice for a taste of Mr. Sutcliffe's talent in objecting lies to his adversary, whereof I have taken six, as you see, that lie in order in the first front, and six others I would gladly handle as they stand in the last rank, but that I wax exceeding weary of such trifling matter as here I find; especially considering the singular insincerity in dealing, that a man may trust nothing that is said or affirmed without examination of the particulars; and yet will I run over six more of the very last, and this with the greatest brevity that may be possible, naming them only as objections that easily answer themselves even by their bare rehearsal.

THE THIRD PART OF THIS CHAPTER,

About two other objected Lies.

THE first charge then of these half-dozen * is, that Father Persons affirmeth that Pope Xistus the Fourth, in his decree about the conception of our Blessed Lady, did leave it free for every one to think what he would thereof; the second, that Father Persons denieth Pope Xistus the Fifth to have compared the slaughter of King Henry the Third of France unto the mysteries of Christ's incarnation and resurrection; the third, that Father Persons chargeth the Protestants to have set forward their new Gospel by arms

* Sutcliffe, p. 311.

and forcible attempts; the fourth, that he denieth Papists to hold it for a matter of sacrilege to dispute of the Pope's doings; the fifth, that the same Father Persons affirmeth that many Protestants and their friends do make princes so absolute in temporal and spiritual affairs in their dominions as they may not be judged by any mortal man; the sixth, that Father Persons denieth any pardon to be sold for murder of children, fornication, adultery, incest, and such other abominations.

27. These are six of the principal and last lies of Mr. Sutcliffe's list against Father Persons, wherewith he endeth his chapter, which are so slender things, as you see, that scarcely they are worth the mentioning; and he that shall read the "Warn-word," in the places here cited, will find so evident proofs for that which the said book hath in this behalf, as the name of a *lie* will hardly fall on Father Persons's side. For that for the first, he citeth two constitutions of Xistus Quartus, the one A.D.

To the first
objection.

1466, and the other 1475,* besides a third of Pius Quintus, beginning *Super specula*, who leave the thing as free, to believe or not believe the conception of our Blessed Lady without sin: *liberam cuique facultatem relinquentes opinandi hujus controversiæ quamlibet partem, prout vel magis piam, vel magis probabilem esse judicaverit*—"leaving free license to every one to think of each part of this controversy, as he shall judge it to be more pious or more probable."

28. Thus wrote Father Persons in the "Warn-word," and convinced evidently Sir Francis Hastings of two gross and manifest untruths, yea wilful, in this matter. The first, that Pope Xistus the Fourth made not any decree or determination for the conception of the Blessed Virgin without original sin, as he affirmeth; for if there had been a decree, then freedom of opinion had not been permitted therein. The second untruth is, that Pope Xistus did excommunicate, and condemn for heretics, those that held the other opinion, that she was not conceived without sin; for if it were free for each man to think what he thought most pious or pro-

About the con-
ception of our
Blessed Lady.

* Warn-word, Enc. 2, c. 12, p. 101.

bable, how could it be condemned for heresy? Nay, Pope Xistus doth expressly decree the contrary, and excommunicate them that do condemn either side of heresy. *We do put under the same pain and censure (saith Pope Xistus) all those that shall presume to affirm "that those who hold the contrary opinion (to wit, that the glorious Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin) do incur heresy or mortal sin thereby;" forsomuch as the matter is not yet decided by the Roman Church and See Apostolic.**

29. So Pope Xistus in his "Extravagant," cap. 2. And what shall we say, then, of Mr. Sutcliffe, that objecteth this, here again, for a principal lie to Father Persons; and after two lies convinced, as you have heard, against Sir Francis, cometh in now again, and saith, *This is false* (that Xistus the Fourth did leave it free for every one to think what he would), *as appeareth in that he did excommunicate all those that spake against the feast of our Lady's conception?* So he. And what shall I say now of Mr. Sutcliffe, that, having seen Sir Francis condemned of these lies before, doth iterate the same without any blushing at all! But let us pass to the rest that ensue, to be despatched more briefly.

To the second
objection.

30. Concerning the second objection, of Xistus Quintus's speech of the King of France's death, and his comparing thereof to the mysteries of Christ's incarnation, for which Mr. Sutcliffe allegeth no proof of any validity, Father Persons thought it sufficient to cite the common opinion and testimony of all Rome and records thereof, that no such thing was ever spoken in the Consistory or elsewhere, in the memory of any man yet living.†

To the third
objection.

31. And for the third, that Protestants have set forward their Gospel by forcible attempts, he remitteth himself to the visible experience of France, Geneva, Germany, Poland, Sweden, Holland, Scotland, and other parts of the world, where the memory thereof is yet fresh in mind. And if the late treatise about "Rebellion and Equivocation" against Mr. Morton were

* Extrav. Commun. de Reliq. et Vener. Sanct. cap. 2.

† Warn-word, p. 103.

written by Father Persons, as many do presume, then hath he laid forth store of examples in the first six chapters of that book, and answered the evasions that may be used for excuse of Protestants proceeding in that behalf. For the fourth, that Catholics hold it not for sacrilege to dispute of the Pope's doings or authority, he referreth us to the books that are extant of all Catholic writers of controversies, who dispute and examine the same without peril of sacrilege or other impiety.

32. For the fifth, that many Protestants hold princes for so absolute, as they may not be judged by any mortal man, he needed not cite any special authority, forsomuch as it is a common position of all Protestants ordinarily, but especially of ours of England. And I think that Mr. Sutcliffe will hardly dare to defend the contrary in good earnest and publicly, where he may be called to account for it; at least, I suppose he would not have done so in the time of the late queen. And as for the sixth and last, that pardon is not sold *for murder of children, fornication, &c.*, at least by allowance of the Roman doctrine, I never talked yet with Catholic, but that he denied the same, as Father Persons doth, remitting us to their public writers and writings for the same, and saying that never any one true testimony may be brought out of their doctrine for averring thereof; forsomuch as all their divines hold and teach, that no pardon can be given by any power upon earth for a sin before it be committed, nor after, except it be first remitted by the sacrament of penance and virtue of Christ's passion that worketh therein. And as for that which Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth out of the book called by him "The Penitentiary Tax," printed at Paris, wherein certain mulcts or pecuniary punishments are appointed for several sins, they say that *if any such thing be*,* they are punishments or penalties appointed to be performed for some satisfaction of temporal pains, after the external

* [The reader will do well to consult Dr. Lingard (Tracts, p. 117) on the subject.]

guilt of sin is remitted and taken away by the sacrament; and that this is a great abuse (either out of ignorance or malice) in Mr. Sutcliffe, to take the one for the other, to wit, satisfactions for pardons, and pardons for sins not yet committed, instead of sins remitted and taken away.

33. And thus much of these half-dozen of objections, as they lie together in the end of his said ninth chapter of principal lies: nor do I find that those that go between, in the bulk of his squadron, are any better, but rather, more infarced with untruths. As, for example, his eighth charge is this; fol. 18 of his book of "Warn-word:"³⁷—

About Justinian's decrees concerning the primacy of the Roman Church.

"Persons saith that the emperor (Justinian), in a certain edict, beginning *Reddentes, Cod. de sum. Trin. fid. Catholicæ*, professeth his due subjection, and of all his empire, to the Church of Rome, which is a notorious and impudent lie; for in that law there is no one word to be found that importeth subjection either of the emperor or empire to the Church of Rome, much less to the Pope of Rome; nay, at that time, the city of Rome belonged to the emperor, which lately the Pope hath usurped." So Mr. Sutcliffe.

34. Wherein I note, first, this markable sleight, that whereas the question is of the spiritual authority and jurisdiction of the Church of Rome, and the subjection of the emperor and empire thereunto, in matters of their soul, he closely conveyeth it to the temporal power and jurisdiction, saying, the city of Rome belonged to the emperor at that time, when the foresaid law was made; whereof there is no question at all; but the point is, whether Pope John, named in this decree, were held for superior in spiritual matters, or no; for which Father Persons, in the "Warn-word,"[†] allegeth two plain decrees of the said Emperor Justinian, the one beginning thus: *Reddentes honorem Apostolicæ Sedi, et vestræ Sanctitati, &c.*—"We, yielding the honour which is due to the See Apostolic and to your Holiness, &c.," *omnes sacerdotes universi orientalis tractus et subicere et unire vestræ Sanc-*

* Sutcliffe, p. 297.

† Warn-word, p. 18.

*titati procuravimus**—"we have been careful to subject and unite unto your Holiness all priests of the universal eastern countries (or empire)." And again: *Nec enim patimur quicquam quod ad ecclesiarum statum pertinet, quam manifestè indubitatum sit, quod movetur, ut non etiam vestræ innotescat Sanctitati, quæ caput est omnium sanctarum ecclesiarum*—"Neither do we suffer any thing that pertaineth to the state of churches, though it be a matter nothing doubted of, to remain unknown unto your Holiness, which is the head of all holy churches." And doth not this evidently prove as much as Father Persons affirmeth? How, then, doth Mr. Sutcliffe call his speech here a notorious and impudent lie? Doth he care what he saith?† Why had not he set down plainly and perspicuously, as Father Persons doth in his "Warn-word," this law of Justinian, as also the other decree of the same code, entitled *Inter Claras*, which approveth‡ those words of Pope John: *Romanam Sedem omnium esse verè ecclesiarum caput, et patrum regulæ et principum statuta declarant*—"That the See of Rome is truly the head of all churches, both the rules of holy fathers and statutes of Christian princes do declare."§ What can be spoken more manifest?

35. And immediately after this, again he chargeth Father Persons with a cluster of lies, for that he saith that

* Cod. l. 1, leg. Reddentes, Tit. 1. [Read, unire *sedī* vestræ sanctitatis *procuravimus*. Corpus Juris. Ed. 1663.]

† [It would seem not. For the reader will have observed that Sutcliffe averred that in the law quoted "there is no one word to be found that importeth subjection to the Church of Rome, much less to the Pope of Rome." The best answer to this was, of course, to quote the text. Persons did so. But Sutcliffe was not abashed: he proceeded to declare the piece, and that likewise which will be presently quoted, to be *forgeries*! to be "monkish and foppish!" (Refutation, &c. p. 6.) It is not worth while to examine his reasons in detail. Suffice it to state that his fourth is: "that this epistle doth here constitute the Bishop of Rome HEAD OF THE CHURCH, whereas," &c.!! Upon comparing this with the afore-cited assertion, we may well ask with Walsingham: Doth he care what he saith?]

‡ [Walsingham must be supposed to mean that the incorporation of the document in the code gives it approbation. For the piece itself (*Inter Claras*) is a letter from Pope John himself to the Emperor Justinian.]

§ Cod. l. 1, *Inter Claras*, Tit. 1.

About the like
of three other
emperors for
the Church of
Rome.

the emperors Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius are more ancient than Justinian, in their law, that beginneth, *Cunctos populos*, which is the first set down in the code of Justinian, do say and decree, appoint and command, all Christian people, both of the Roman and Greek empires, to follow the faith and religion of the Roman church, delivered unto them by St. Peter, and continued unto that day, and which Damasus, the bishop of that city, doth follow, as also Peter, Bishop of Alexandria; and that whosoever did not follow this unity of religion should be counted infamous heretics. So allegeth Father Persons, out of the code itself.* But what answereth Mr. Sutcliffe? *Neither doth Gratian* (saith he), *Valentinian, and Theodosius write to Damasus, nor do they say that Damasus was head and leader of the universal visible church.*† And now look what a worthy evasion this is; for Father Persons doth not say that they wrote their law to Pope Damasus, but of Pope Damasus and of his authority. And albeit the decree hath not Mr. Sutcliffe's formal words, of *head and leader of the universal visible church*, yet they have the equivalent thereunto, as you have heard; they affirming and decreeing that the Roman Church, whereof Damasus was head, to be the guide and director for matters of religion in their days; and that all people, of both empires, as well East as West, were specially bound to follow her, under pain to be judged infamous heretics.‡

36. I am forced to pass over a huge heap of other such like accusations, which I found all, for the most part, devoid of substance; so as I was exceedingly wearied and cloyed in this search; for he objecteth every thing, almost, for a principal lie, though he knew it himself to be never so evidently true, as out of the emperors' decrees aforementioned appeareth. And so here again he objecteth, with great asseveration, as another principal lie, that Father Persons, talking of Queen Anne Boleyn, saith, that Cranmer was used for her defamation after her death,

* Warn-word, fol. 18.

† Sutcliffe, p. 297.

‡ Warn-word, fol. 19.

as is extant at this day in the foresaid statute itself, where Cranmer's sentence is recorded, judicially given by him; *which (saith Mr. Sutcliffe) is so impudently and falsely spoken, as the same may convince him of most shameless lying; for there is no such sentence as is here mentioned recorded in the act, as any man may see that listeth to read it.* And yet further: *Do you, then, think that Persons blusheth to say any thing, that is not ashamed to lie against public acts and records?* Thus Mr. Sutcliffe.

37. But when I went to the printed statutes of King Henry VIII., and viewed the place cited by Father Persons, in the seventh chapter of the acts made in the year twenty-eight of King Henry VIII., I found in a particular statute, entitled, "For the Establishment of the Succession," &c., made after the putting to death of the said Queen Anne, that her marriage made with King Henry by the hands and ministry of Bishop Cranmer that married them, and defended the same against the Pope, so long as the King liked it, the same marriage was now pretended by him, and sentenced also, never to have been good. The words of the statute are these:*

About Queen
Anne Bullen.

38. "And albeit, most dread sovereign lord (say they), that the said acts formerly made for the legitimization of Lady Elizabeth, were then made, as it was then thought by your Majesty's nobles and commons, upon a pure, perfect, and clear foundation, thinking the said marriage then had between your highness and the said Lady Anne in their consciences to have been pure, sincere, perfect, and good, and so was reputed and taken in the realm till now of late that God of his infinite goodness (from whom no secret things can be hidden) hath caused to be brought to light evident and open knowledge, as well certain just, true, and lawful impediments, unknown at the making of the said acts, and since that time confessed by the said Lady Anne before the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, Metropolitan and Primate of all England, sitting judicially for the same; by the which plainly appeareth that the said marriage be-

* See the Statutes of King Henry VIII., in fol., printed by Thomas Berthlet, London, A.D. 1551.

tween your grace and the said Lady Anne was never good nor consonant to the laws, but utterly void, and of none effect; by reason whereof your highness was and is lawfully divorced and separated from the bands of the said marriage in the life of the said Lady Anne."

Mr. Sutcliffe
combined by
act of his par-
liament.

39. Hitherto are the words of the statute. And now must you remember Mr. Sutcliffe's words, that it *was a lie, yea, an impudent and shameless lie, to affirm that any such act or sentence was extant or recorded, as any man may see* (saith he) *that listeth to read it.* But we have read it, seen it, and found it quite contrary to that he so confidently protesteth. And how then, or with what face or conscience, can he say that Father Persons is not ashamed to lie here against public acts and records? Shall we think that Mr. Sutcliffe hath any other records for his side than the public printed acts of parliament?

40. But that which is yet more ridiculous, he inventeth a certain reason to prove that Bishop Cranmer gave no such sentence of divorce between the King and Queen Anne Bullen. *For what needeth a sentence* (saith he) *of divorce against her, that was now put to death?* To which wise reason or interrogation may be answered, that for her that was dead little need there was of any further divorce: but for the King that was alive, and meant to disinherit Lady Elizabeth, daughter to Queen Anne, as illegitimate, upon the sentence of divorce (and so did, in this very act of parliament)—for these respects (I say) intended by the King, it was not only needful, but necessary also to have a public judicial act and sentence of illegitimation to pass by the Archbishop of Canterbury, sitting judicially for the same, as this act of parliament expressly affirmeth that he did.

41. And now Mr. Sutcliffe being taken in so manifest want of fidelity, I do not see why we should follow him any further in this search; and yet am I tempted, in respect of the multitude of lies objected by him and the variety of his deceits used therein, to take some more as they lie,* which are eighteen in one charge, and above an

* Sutcliffe, p. 302.

hundred charges are given by him of like quality to those which you have heard. And one of his eighteen objected lies, yea, the very first, is, *That Persons affirmeth Carolostadius, Ecolampadius, and Zuinglius to have been Luther's scholars*; secondly, that they were opposite to Luther; thirdly, that the Anabaptists rose out of Luther's doctrine; fourthly, that Calvin and Beza issued from Zuinglius; fifthly, that Zuinglius died in rebellion against his country; sixthly, that Ecolampadius was found dead in his bed by his wife's side, strangled by the devil, as Luther holdeth, *lib. de Privata Missa*; seventhly, that great wars arose between Luther and Zuinglius; eighthly, that Luther was the first father of the Protestant gospel, and the like. All which, being termed by him principal lies, and refuted only by his bare denial, without any other improof, are yet known to the learned to have infinite proofs for their justification; whereof no small store is set down by Father Persons, both in his "Warn-word" and in the "Defence of the Censure," and by occasion we have handled some before and others are everywhere handled and inculcated lightly in all books of controversy of these our times.

42. I let pass that other heinous objection made by him in the same page, where he accuseth Father Persons of a great lie, "for that he writeth, in the fortieth leaf of his 'Warn-word,' that the Protestants are wont to say, that St. Bernard was no flatterer, especially in his book of 'Consideration' to Pope Eugenius, to whom he speaketh very plainly touching any defects that might be in his own person," &c., which Mr. Sutcliffe taketh very heinously, saying, "Because the man is wont to lie, no man will believe him unless he bring forth the parties that have so said. For that to call the Pope Abraham, Melchisedech, and Christ, as Bernard doth, savoureth of flattery," &c. So he. But I, going to the place quoted by Father Persons, in St. Bernard,* I find that holy man, to distinguish between the *person* and the *office* of the Pope, advertising him of the defects that may be of the one, and acknowledging the

Eighteen bairn
lies objected
by Mr. Sut-
cliffe.

Whether St.
Bernard were
a flatterer or
no.

* Bern. l. 2, De Consid. ad Eug.

high power and dignity that is in the other, by which all is accorded, and rather a will discovered in Mr. Sutcliffe to heap matter of accusations, or rather calumniations, than reason or substance for the same.

43. All which being so, and so little or rather nothing being substantially proved in this kind against Father Persons, it held me astonished to see, notwithstanding what Mr. Sutcliffe writeth in the end of this chapter,* as if he had proved much: *May we not then rightly conclude* (saith he) *that Persons is a most notorious and impudent liar?*

Strange baunting of Mr. Sutcliffe.

But I would ask him whereupon he may "conclude" this, to the end that I may "conclude"

also with him: for out of all that which hitherto hath been alleged, I see not how any such "conclusion" may probably be deduced, and yet, in almost the next lines after, he saith again: "If all lies ought to be far removed from religion, then is it not religion which Persons doth maintain with so many lies, nor can his lies stand with the ground of religion. And, finally, I say to the deceived Papists, as Constantine said to the deceived heretics of his time: Behold by what lies the vanity of your doctrine is maintained." Thus he.

44. And, when I remembered in how many apparent, manifest, and palpable untruths Mr. Sutcliffe had been taken before, even in objecting wrongfully these lies to Father Persons and others, and how few, or none rather at all, he hath proved hitherto against his adversary, that I can find, and yet to hear him speak and vaunt in this manner, I doubted truly whether the man did think upon what he saith or writeth, or that he speaketh rather at random, without reflection, either upon truth or falsity. All which made me exceeding loath to go forward in search of any more of his objections, and yet for that I have promised, I will adjoin the third examen of some other which he hath in another later book, which he calleth "The Subversion of Robert Persons," &c., for that (as before I think I have noted) in all his books set forth since the year 1600, when the untrue dealing of Monsieur Plessis Mornay was examined before the King of France, and published after-

* Sutcliffe, p. 314.

ward, not only in French by the said King's authority, but briefly also in English by Father Persons, as Mr. Sutcliffe believeth, and that an Englishman in like manner whom, in contempt, he calleth Owlglass (though it seem by his book of "Detection," that he had very good eyes and insight to observe Mr. Sutcliffe's defects in writing), had discovered thirteen notorious untruths in one chapter of his "Challenge." Since this time (I say) Mr. Sutcliffe being nettled, as it seemeth, with these two stings, hath taken a course in all his books to bestow a great part thereof in gathering out lists and catalogues of lies against his adversaries, but with the bad success which you have heard in the former two books of "Defence of his Charge" and "Full and Round Answer," And now shall we see whether we have any better in this his third, entitled, as hath been said, "The Subversion of Robert Persons's three Conversions of England."

CHAPTER VII.

Of other Objections of Lies, Falsities, Corruptions, and other such abuses, gathered by Mr. Sutcliffe against Father Persons in his Answer to the Book of "Three Conversions," which he entitleth "A Subversion of Robert Persons," &c.

The book of "Three Conversions" and his arguments. MASTER SUTCLIFFE, taking upon him to answer the book, named the "Three Conversions of England," composed, as he saith, by Father Persons, who therein pretendeth to deduce the lineal and visible continuance and succession of one and the self-same universal Christian and Catholic Church from Christ and his apostles' time to ours, handling therein divers great points and matters of moment, out of ecclesiastical histories, councils, and fathers, Mr. Sutcliffe doth, in twelve small chapters, answer the said book, which containeth five-and-twenty large ones, and that, as it seemeth to the more learned sort, as well Protestants as Catholics, very little to the purpose; for that he omitteth or dissembleth the most important controversies therein handled, as after, upon occasion, will more in particular be declared; but yet, after his said twelve chapters, that contain the whole substance of his answer, he adjoineth other seven, of personal and particular criminations, against his adversary, drawing the same to sundry heads; as, *of wresting and corrupting Scriptures, falsifying the fathers, Thrasonical brags, gross ignorance, blasphemous speeches, notorious lies, falsifications, and calumniations; and finally, for alleging texts and authorities against himself.* And in this he spendeth more than a third part of his whole book; whereof, if I could hope to see any one point of wilful and witting falsehood, among so many objected, well and sufficiently proved (this being our question and principal

point of our search in this place), I should think my labour not altogether lost in taking pain to go through them; but having had experience of so many vain charges given before in this kind by him, and so little proved, I expect nothing but to lose my labour, especially forsomuch as, in all

*The despair I
had by Mr.
Sutcliffe's
manner of pro-
ceeding.*

or the most of these objections, he scarce attempteth to prove or disprove any thing, but only to object, accuse, or deny; and that with such abrupt and obscure brevity, as it is evidently seen that he desired only to make a muster of many objections, good or bad, false or true, probable or improbable; yea, though never so vain and impertinent to the purpose, to the end he might seem to have been diligent and copious in gathering observations against his adversary, though often in mere trifles, but always, or for the most part, with some deceit or malice on his side. And in this I speak no more than presently will be found by the examination of the particulars themselves; wherein truly I was so much scandalized, to see the little conscience of this man in writing, that no one thing did more move me to doubt first, and then to leave, his religion, than to see him treat thereof with so little truth, or intention of truth, as to me it seemed; for I presumed with myself, that if he could have satisfied his adversary with any kind of truth, he would not so often and openly have uttered untruths.

2. But, to come to the matter, we shall first lay down some objections of his that are impertinent and vain, and then such as are more malicious, wilful, and known to be merely false by the objector himself. The title of his first chapter of these seven being that "Father Persons hath no conscience in wresting and corrupting Scriptures," he bringeth many instances for some show thereof: as, first of all, for that the argument of his book of "Three Conversions of England" being to demonstrate and lay forth the antiquity and continuance of the church, from time to time, he set down for his poesy, in the first page thereof, these words, taken out of Deuteronomy: *In-quire of ancient times before you, remember the old days of your forefathers, consider of every age as they have passed, ask your father, and he will tell you, demand*

First objection.

of your ancestors, and they will declare unto you.* And this is the first objected corruption of Scripture which Mr. Sutcliffe bringeth forth against Father Persons, affirming this scripture to make nothing for his purpose, which is (quoth he) *to insinuate thereby that we are to look back, not to ancient truth, but to the Pope's decretals and corruptions of former times.*† But it seemeth that Father

How we must
look back.

Persons's meaning is far otherwise, to wit, that men look back to the more ancient and purer times, wherein these our controversies were not yet sprung up, and consequently are more sincere and incorrupt witnesses than the sayings and asseverations of particular interested men in these our days.

Second objec-
tion.

3. His second instance is, where Father Persons, in his epistle to the Catholics of England, exhorteth them to patience and perseverance in suffering persecution, using, among other words, those of St. Paul to the Philippians: *To you it is given, not only to believe in Christ, but also to suffer for him;*‡ which Mr. Sutcliffe counteth for another corruption of Scripture; for that, as he saith, they suffer not for Christ, but for Antichrist, and most of them know not what it is to believe in Christ. Whereunto I think nothing needful to be answered; forsomuch as the works of the one and the other do easily testify who have the better belief in Christ.

Third objec-
tion.

His third instance is, for that Father Persons, treating of the same argument of suffering for Christ, citeth and alludeth to those other words of the said apostle in the same place, where he saith, that *his chains for Christ were made manifest in all tribunals*; which Mr. Sutcliffe reckoneth, in like manner, for a conscienceless corruption; § *for that* (saith he) *Papists never suffered yet for Christ, nor were ever called before any bar or tribunal for his sake.* Of this, also, let other men judge how true it is.

Fourth objec-
tion.

4. His fourth instance is, where Father Persons, to the same effect of comforting Catholics in persecution, useth those words of the same apostle to the Thessalonians: "You are become such followers of Christ and his apostles, as, receiving the word of God with

* Deuter. iv. 32; xxxii. 7.

† Philip. i.

‡ Subv. fol. 106.

§ Subv. p. 107.

joy of the Holy Ghost, in great tribulation, you are made an example or spectacle to all other faithful people, &c.”* Which Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth for another intolerable corruption, saying, *Let indifferent men judge how madly he applieth and violently wresteth Holy Scripture to serve his lewd purpose; for Papists follow not Christ nor his apostles, but Antichrist, &c.*† And thus he goeth forward throughout the whole chapter; wherein we see that there is nothing of wilful falsehood, or contrary to his knowledge or conscience, may be objected probably to Father Persons, if we suppose him to be, in heart, of that religion which he professeth, as scarce any, I think, will presume the contrary. So as this seemed very light and idle matter, much like to his trifling about Baronius’s picture, before touched, and unfit to be objected in so great a charge of wilful corruptions. And indeed it seemed to be a great argument, that Mr. Sutcliffe had little or nothing of substance to allege against his adversary, when he descendeth to such trifles as these are; and in very deed, upon further trial and perusal of his book, in all the fore-said seven chapters of accusations and criminations, I found that either the matters objected were trifles, or little pertinent, or calumniously urged, or wrongfully and wilfully falsified against him. Of the former sort are not only these examples which before we have mentioned, but many other, in like manner; all which were over tedious here to be rehearsed, for they are very many; yet some, for example sake, we shall lay forth to the reader’s consideration.

Trifling objections, instead of substantial.

5. He objecteth then ‡ for another falsification and corruption of St. Augustine unto Father Persons, for that alleging these words of his: *Hæc est laus fidei, si quod creditur, non videtur*, he doth English it thus: §—“The praise or merit of faith standeth in this, that the thing be not seen which is to be believed;” where, saith Mr. Sutcliffe, the word *merit* is added, which is not in the Latin text. But doth not every man see this to be a trifling objection? For that it is lawful in translating, when the Latin words are exactly set down, to add

Fifth objection.

* 1 Thess. i.

† Sutcl. Ibid.

‡ Subv. p. 111.

§ Three Convers. pref.; August. Tract 79 in Joan.

now and then some word of explication for the reader's better understanding by the particle *or*? And forso-much as, immediately before, the sentence of St. Gregory* was cited to the same effect, which saith, *Non habet fidei MERITUM, ubi humana ratio præbet experimentum*—"Faith hath no merit where man's reason doth make the thing evident,"—clear it is that the meaning of St. Augustine's sentence is the same as of the other of St. Gregory, to wit, that the praise and mention of faith is to believe that which is not seen, according to the express words of our Saviour, in St. John's Gospel.† "Because thou hast seen, Thomas, thou hast believed; but happy are they that have not seen and yet have believed;" which must be needs understood of their merit or desert in believing that which they saw not: all which argueth not only the vanity of this objection, but malice also, in my opinion; for that Mr. Sutcliffe could not but see and read in the next precedent lines the sentence of St. Augustine expounded by St. Gregory, and the word *merit* itself set down, as you have heard.

6. Moreover, in his page 112, he objecteth to Sixth objection. Father Persons for another falsification of fathers, yea, and absurdity, that he affirmeth‡ Pope Eleutherius, in the second age after Christ, to have converted King Lucius and the Britons by St. Damianus and his fellows, sent from Rome. *It is absurd to say* (quoth Mr. Sutcliffe) *that Eleutherius did convert the Britons by Damianus; for if Damianus preached unto them, then did he convert them, and not Eleutherius.* Is not this a substantial reason? Cannot a man do a thing by another? What if a man should pay money by his servant, or substitute, may he not be said to have paid it? What if a prince sent ambassadors to make peace with another prince, may not the prince be said to have made the peace? Or if a general should impugn and take a fort by his captains, could not he be said to have taken it, for that he used other men's employment therein? Who would reason thus but Mr. Sutcliffe, and put it so fondly in print against his adversary?

Seventh objection.

7. In the very same page he objecteth to Father Persons for a false allegation and cor-

* Greg. Hom. 26, in Evang.

† John xx.

‡ Three Convers. p. 3.

ruption of St. Bede, that he maketh him to say, in the first book of his "History of England," that St. Augustine (the monk) and his fellows entered into Canterbury, in procession, with a cross, and the image of our Saviour in a banner, *which is more than his author doth warrant*, saith Mr. Sutcliffe. Whereupon I, resorting to the relation itself of Bede, I found it wholly against Mr. Sutcliffe, for that the question being between Sir Francis Hastings and Father Persons, in his book of "Three Conversions,"* whether in the time of St. Gregory the Great, that sent St. Augustine into England, the use of saying masses and honouring images were allowed (which Sir Francis denied, and the other took upon him to prove), he cited for the same the relation of venerable Bede † of the first entrance of the said Augustine and his fellows into Canterbury, saying, *Divini virtute præditi veniebant crucem pro vexillo ferentes argenteam, imaginem Domini Salvatoris in tabula depictam, litaniasque canentes*—"They came endued with heavenly virtue, carrying a silver cross for their flag or banner, and a picture of Christ our Saviour painted in a table, and singing litanies." ‡ And then, a little after, he hath these words again: *Fertur autem quod appropinquant civitati, more suo cum cruce sancta, et imagine magni Regis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, hanc litaniam consona voce modularentur, Deprecamur te Domine in omni misericordia tua, &c.*—"And it is said when they drew near the city (of Canterbury) they, according to their custom, with the holy cross and image of the Great King our Lord Jesus Christ, did with one voice sing this litany, 'We beseech thee, O Lord, in all thy mercy,' " &c. And then, a little after again, of their preaching, baptizing, and saying masses, he writeth thus: *Erat autem, &c.*—"There was near unto the city, at the east side thereof, a church built in old time, while the Romans did possess Britany, to the honour of St. Martin, in which the queen (which, as before we have said, was Christian) was accustomed to make her prayers, *In hac ergo et ipsi primò convenire, psallere, orare, MISSAS FACERE, prædicare, et baptizare cæperunt*—"In this church,

St. Augustine's
entrance into
Canterbury.

* Three Convers. p. 7.

† Bed. l. 1, c. 26.

‡ Ibid. l. 1, c. 25.

St. Augustine
and his fellows
said mass at
Canterbury.

therefore, these men began first to meet together, to sing, to praise, TO SAY MASSES, to preach, and to baptize:" and all this is in Bede, which containeth more points against Mr. Sutcliffe than Father Persons mentioned. For here is not only the name and use of masses, crosses, and images, but of litanies also, which, according to Mr. Sutcliffe, is another Popish abuse. So as how, or why, he should accuse Father Persons of falsification, and false allegation in this behalf, I cannot see; for, as for that he objecteth Bede speaketh not of procession, nor the image of our Saviour in a banner, let the discreet reader examine the words and he shall see true effect and substance thereof set down; and so I leave this as a querulous and trifling objection.

Eighth objection.

8. After this again he objecteth against Father Persons, in his chapter of falsifications and corruptions of fathers, thus: *He telleth us that few of the Britons observed Easter after the manner of the Eastern Church, and fathereth this fable upon Bede in divers places; but Bede himself, in lib. 2, Histor. cap. 2, refuteth his foolish tale, shewing that Austin objected this observance to the bishops of Britain.** But when I resorted unto the place cited out of Father Persons's book, I find not him to use at all the word *few*, but only affirmeth that all Britany held not that error in Bede's time, as Fox falsely had avouched, for proof whereof he allegeth,† that all the English churches then in Britany were free, and many of the Scots and Irish also, as Bede expressly affirmeth in his second book and nineteenth chapter. And as for the second book and second chapter, cited by Mr. Sutcliffe, it hath no opposition at all to Father Persons's speech, for there he saith only, *Augustinus convocavit ad suum colloquium episcoposive doctores proximæ Britonum provinciæ*—"Augustine called to his conference the bishops or doctors of the next province of the Britons, and brotherly warned them to leave the foresaid unlawful custom," &c. So as here is no mention of all Britons in this time of St. Augustine, and much less above an hundred years after in the time of St. Bede, as Father Persons proveth John Fox untruly to have

* Subv. p. 114.

† Three Convers. p. 33.

affirmed, and consequently this objection of Mr. Sutcliffe is found to have no foundation at all, but to be a mere cavil.

9. In the very next place following he giveth another charge upon Father Persons, for that ^{Ninth objection.} he going about to prove out of the ancient Father Irenæus the tradition and succession of the bishops of Rome, most highly esteemed by him in his days for confounding all heretics, as he said, that dissented from the same, Mr. Sutcliffe, to contradict this, accuseth him of falsification and corruption, saying thus: "In the allegation out of Irenæus, *lib. 3, Adversus Hæres. cap. 3*, he choppeth off the beginning of the sentence which declareth, that the tradition of other churches was as well to be respected as that of Rome;" which, when I had considered and laid together with Father Persons's allegation, and the text of Irenæus itself, sincerely cited by him,* as after I found, I could not but laugh, first at the vanity of the cavil, it helping nothing his purpose, and then at his falsehood in perverting wholly the meaning of St. Irenæus, for which cause he flyeth to set down the words themselves, found in Father Persons, which are these out of Irenæus: *Maximæ et antiquissimæ ecclesiæ, &c.*—"We, shewing the tradition of the greatest and most ancient Church of Rome (saith Irenæus), known to all the world as founded by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul (which tradition and faith she receiving from the apostles, hath preached and delivered unto us by succession of her bishops, from time to time, unto our days), do confound thereby all those heretics, which by any ways, either through delight in themselves, or vain-glory, or blindness of understanding, do gather otherwise than they should. For that unto this church, in respect of her more mighty principality, it is necessary that all churches must agree and have access,†

* Three Convers. p. 129; Iren. l. 3, c. 3, Advers. Hæres.

† [Omnem convenire ecclesiam. Persons has given a twofold version of the verb. Several eminent writers, amongst whom the noted Protestant controvertist Salmasius may be instanced, have adopted the *former* of the renderings. Walsingham, as will be seen presently, adopts the *latter*, or at least its equivalent, "repair to." Dr. Möhler has minutely investigated this interesting passage (*Die Einheit in der Kirche*, p. 268. Ed. 1825): and the learned Dominican Valsecchi has triumphantly vindicated it from the exceptions taken by Mosheim. (*Verita della Chiesa Cattolica Romana*, p. 134—156. Padua, 1794).]

that is to say, all faithful people wheresoever they live, in which church the tradition that hath descended from the apostles hath ever been kept by those that live in any place of the world." These are the words of St. Irenæus, who speaketh of the succession of the bishops and Church of Rome, which presently after he doth recount from St. Peter of Linus, and from him by succession unto Eleutherius that sat as bishop in his days, and is recorded to have sent Damianus and his fellows to convert King Lucius and the Britons of our country, as before hath been said.*

An egregious
corruption by
Mr. Sutcliffe.

10. But now, what is that beginning of Irenæus' sentence which Mr. Sutcliffe accuseth Father Persons to have chopped off? *for that it declareth (saith he) that the tradition of other churches was as well to be respected as that of Rome.* Thus it standeth in the author: *Sed quoniam valdè longum est in tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ et antiquissimæ, &c.*—"But for that it were very long in such volume as this is, to number up the succession of all churches, we, laying forth the tradition and faith of the greatest and most ancient church of Rome founded by the apostles, do confound all heretics," &c. This is the beginning in Irenæus of the words before cited, which Mr.

The principal-
pality of the
Church of
Rome by St.
Irenæus.

Sutcliffe complaineth to have been cut off. And what or how doth this beginning help Mr. Sutcliffe or his cause? Irenæus saith that forsomuch as it was overlong to set down the succession of all churches, he setteth down that of Rome, as the greatest and most ancient and known to all, and founded by the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul; all which maketh for the pre-eminence of Rome, and contradicteth expressly the assertion of Mr. Sutcliffe affirming Irenæus to hold, that the successions and traditions of other churches are as well to be respected as that of Rome, which St. Irenæus, not only in these words, but in the other before cited, doth evidently impugn, when he saith not only that the Church of Rome is the greatest and most principal, but also that all other churches must repair unto this. *Ad hanc enim (saith he) ecclesiam propter*

* Third Conv. p. 8.

potentior principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam—"It is necessary that all churches do come or repair to this church, in respect of her more powerful principality." Consider then, I pray you, gentle reader, with what truth or prudence Mr. Sutcliffe hath objected the allegation of this place for a corruption and falsification in Father Persons, which maketh so evidently against himself: but let us proceed.

11. Another grievous accusation of lying and calumniating the Magdeburgians is objected to Father Persons by Mr. Sutcliffe, for that he maketh them to say, *That Christians' doctrine fell away in the time of the doctors: but his report (saith he) is false and slanderous, for they speak only of a decay or declination in some points of doctrine and in some doctors, and not of any falling away or corruption in all the doctors or in all points of their doctrine.** But, truly, when I compared the places together, I found this one of the most solemn deceits to abuse the reader that ever I saw, and much more than I could ever imagine if I had not seen it. For, first of all, there is much guile in that Mr. Sutcliffe nameth not what doctors, nor of what time or age, he meaneth, but affirmeth that Father Persons maketh the Centurians or Magdeburgians to say in general, *that Christian doctrine fell away in the time of the doctors*; whereas Father Persons, in his book of "Three Conversions,"† did explicate both the one and the other, to wit, that he meant of the chief ancient fathers and doctors of the second and third age after Christ, about which the question was between him and Sir Francis Hastings, whether sacrifice of the mass and such other points now held for Popery were then in use and acknowledged, or no; and Father Persons proveth that they were, by the testimonies of the Magdeburgians themselves,‡ who, in their second and third centuries, do reprehend St. Ignatius, St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, Tertullian, Martial, and other fathers of those ages, for using the terms of *sacrifice*, and *sacrificing*, *obla-*

Centy objection.

* Subv. p. 132.

† Convers. p. 9.

‡ Centur. 2 et 3, c. 4, De Doctrina. [Inclinatio doctrinæ, complectens stipulas et errores doctorum.]

tions, and offering to God upon Christian altars and the like, which seemed to me a great and strong proof taken from the confession of the chiefest learned Protestants of our age; all which Mr. Sutcliffe concealing from his reader, and proposing the controversy in darkness, accusing Father Persons to make the Magdeburgians say, *that Christian doctrine fell away in the time of the doctors*, not specifying what doctors, sheweth evidently that he meant not to be understood, nor to have his reader perceive, what the question was in particular, but answereth the most strangely that ever I heard, saying, first, that the *Magdeburgians speak only of a decay or declination in some points of doctrine in those first and purest ages*, whereunto notwithstanding Protestants are wont most confidently to appeal in all controversies (especially such as this of the mass and sacrifice is) between Papists and them.

12. Secondly, he saith that this declination was *in some doctors*, and not in all doctors; but he doth not express what doctors or fathers of those ages they do except. Sure I am, that such as now have been mentioned to be reprehended by them were of the chief. Thirdly, he excuseth the matter, saying, *that this decay and declination was not in all points of doctrine*, which must needs be granted, for that if in those ages all doctors had fallen away in all points of doctrine, it had been a general apostasy, and not only a decay or declination from the truth. So as by all this I see nothing gotten to Mr. Sutcliffe, but much lost; for neither doth he defend his clients, the Magdeburgians, well, nor bringeth he any thing in truth against his adversary for wronging the Magdeburgians, for that Father Persons avoucheth not, that they condemned all doctors and fathers of the foresaid ages, of declination from Christian doctrine, or in all points, but such only as he named in particular, and in the controversy about the mass and some other points there handled. And gladly would I know how Mr. Sutcliffe can handsomely shift himself or the Magdeburgians of this false and foolish imputation as to me it seemeth.

Eleventh objection.

13. After this he objecteth further to Father Persons, that in the 120th page of his

book of "Three Conversions" he saith that auricular confession is in itself repugnant to man's sensual nature, which he holdeth for a great absurdity.* But Father Persons's words are these: *Greater difficulty would have been about the use of sacramental confession, if it had not been appointed by Christ, and put in use presently, and so continued from time to time. For that it being a thing in itself most repugnant to man's sensual nature to be bound to open his particular sins to another; clear it is, that if it had not been of obligation from the beginning it would never have been received afterward.*† To which speech Mr. Sutcliffe answereth with this scoff. *As if* (saith he) *it were not as natural to confess a truth as to deny a truth,*‡ which yet seemed to me so poor and false a shift as natural experience overthroweth the same. For what natural man is there that doth not blush more to confess his secret sins than to deny or dissemble them? And I think that Mr. Sutcliffe, as well as I and others, may give himself for an example of human frailty in this behalf. Only I am sure, that when he is taken, here in this our Search, to have uttered untruths, which is very often, as you have heard, he sheweth himself readier to deny the same or to excuse it than to confess it; which I take to proceed as well from natural inclination as from voluntary choice and election. And so much for this.

14. Furthermore, he objecteth for a matter of gross ignorance to Father Persons, in that he promiseth§ to prove the truth of certain articles in controversy between Protestants and them, not only *via affirmativa*, but also *negativa*; *which passeth the reach of common foolery* (saith Mr. Sutcliffe), *for who ever heard affirmative propositions proved by negative?*|| Whereat I could not but wonder, having heard and seen the same myself in England proved divers times, and in ^{Twelfth objection.} sundry cases. As, for examples: if a man were robbed or slain in a house where there were but two persons that might be accused thereof, if I could certainly prove the negative of the one, I should evidently by this negative

* Subv. p. 125.

† Three Convers. p. 120.

‡ Subv. ubi supra.

§ Three Convers. p. 104.

|| Subv. p. 124.

infer the affirmative against the other. And further, among divines, I have heard it for a general position, that whatsoever we know of the nature of God in himself, we know it commonly *via negativa*, by negation of proprieties agreeing to creatures; as that he is infinite, immortal, immense, invisible, immovable, immutable, uncreated, and the like, which are all negatives that do infer affirmatives. And I marvelled much that Mr. Sutcliffe would so grossly be overseen in this matter.

15. But much more I marvelled when I went to view the place in the "Three Conversions," where this *way negative* is set down so plainly and perspicuously, as I do not see what may be said against it. For his ground is this: that if the doctrines of mass, Pope's supremacy, confession, and such like points now in controversy, were not received in the first ages of the primitive church, as Mr. Sutcliffe and others do hold, then must it be shewn by the Protestants when each of these doctrines began, where, how, and upon what occasion, by what authors, with what contradiction or opposition at their first entrance, as new false doctrines spring up in the church are wont to have. But this, saith he, cannot be shewed; and

A point worthy
to be well consi-
dered upon.

consequently this negative proveth the other affirmative, that they were doctrines descending from Christ and his apostles, and received from age to age without contradiction; for that otherwise, if they had not been received in the apostles' time, but brought in afterward against the doctrine and custom of the said apostles, they would have been contradicted by some holy father or other, and noted for errors or novelties when they first appeared or sprung up in the church, as all other heresies continually were. But this contradiction, saith he, cannot be proved, nor any memory brought when they began: and consequently out of this negative is the affirmative proved, that all these doctrines of mass, supremacy, confession, &c., were held for true and Catholic in the apostles' time also and succeeding ages after them.

Thirteenth ob-
jection.

16. He objecteth furthermore, out of the 146th page of the "Three Conversions," that

two treatises are there alleged by Father Persons as of St. Cyprian, the one *de Bono Pudicitiae*, the other *de Nativitate Christi*, wherein St. Cyprian doth highly commend virginity above marriage, for which he is sharply reprehended by the Magdeburgians, in their "Centuries;"* which Mr. Sutcliffe seeing, concealeth craftily the names of his said doctors and friends, the Magdeburgians, and turning himself against Father Persons, saith, *that it is mere simplicity in him to judge them to be St. Cyprian's.*† But how much worse than simplicity is this in Mr. Sutcliffe, that must needs see and know that Father Persons hath no part at all in this, for that he neither affirmeth or denieth the matter as of himself, though other learned men do hold the same works to be of St. Cyprian, at least the one of them, and the other of Pope Cornelius,‡ that lived with him; but citeth the said books as he found them cited by the Magdeburgians themselves. So as in their judgment, who being more in number and more learned in history (as they will say) than Mr. Sutcliffe, these treatises are works of St. Cyprian. But howsoever it be, I see not how Mr. Sutcliffe, objecting simplicity herein to Father Persons, can avoid the note of duplicity and witting calumny in himself.

17. Another like accusation is § where he ob- Fourteenth ob-
jecteth against Father Persons for a point of section.
gross ignorance, for that he misallegeth the number of a chapter, to wit, the twenty-ninth for the twenty-sixth, out of Eusebius, about a learned discourse, which Father Persons saith to be of Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea, concerning the observation of Easter-day, written about forty years before the first Council of Nice, part whereof is set down, saith Father Persons, || by Eusebius in his "Ecclesiastical History," as also by St. Augustine, &c. Out of which words Mr. Sutcliffe draweth this charge of gross ignorance.

* Centur. 2, c. 3, p. 86.

† Subv. p. 126.

‡ St. Cyprian, *De Bono Pudicitiae*, *De Nativitate Christi*—though other learned men do hold the same works to be of St. Cyprian, at least the one of them, and the other of P. Cornelius. (a)

§ Subv. p. 204.

|| Three Convers. p. 54.

(a) [They may both be seen in the *Appendix* to St. Cyprian's works. (Fell's edition, p. 5 and p. 23.) There can be no doubt that they are supposititious.]

A notable fond
trick of Mr.
Sutcliffe.

He allegeth (saith he) Eusebius, lib. 7, Histor. c. 29, whereas there are but twenty-six chapters of that book in Christopherson's version; which seemed to me mere cavil out of voluntary fraud. For that going to Eusebius, and finding there the whole matter at large down, which is insinuated by Father Persons, and considering how easily the figures of 26 might be made 29 by the printer, by only turning down the head of the figure of 6, it angered me to see such trifling and cavilling, as also such fraud in concealing the substance of the matter itself, which is wholly there, and Mr. Sutcliffe could not but see it, and yet would with fraud pick quarrels at ciphers and syllables, as you see. For why had not he confessed that the whole discourse, mentioned by Father Persons of Bishop Anatolius, was in that twenty-sixth chapter, which he confessed to have read, and that it was the last chapter of that book, and consequently must needs know that the quotation of 29 must needs be an error of the printer?

Fifteenth ob-
jection.

18. But let us hear a greater charge out of his chapter of blasphemies. *Persons alloweth (saith he) in the page 114 of his book, the donation of King Ethelwolfe, that gave lands to God, the Blessed Virgin, and all the saints; but what is more impious than to match creatures with the Creator?** But I would ask, what blasphemy doth Father Persons commit in this, that citeth but the words of sundry ancient authors for this fact of King Ethelwolfe?† Is not this a great facility in numbering up blasphemies? What ground or substance is there in this childish imputation?

Sixteenth ob-
jection.

19. After this there followeth another charge of blasphemy (for so is the title of his chapter) *for laughing (as he saith) at King Edward the Sixth as a child-king, as if the children of kings (quoth he) were not to succeed their fathers in their kingdoms.‡* But I could not but laugh at this calumniation; for when I repaired to the book itself of "Three Conversions," I found the quite contrary. For that Father Persons, talking of the contentions that were in England, in the beginning of King

* Subv. p. 128.

† Three Convers. p. 114.

‡ Subv. p. 129.

Edward's days, under the Protector, the Duke of Somerset, and the troubles laid upon Catholics in that first change of religion, writeth in this manner :* " And hereupon divers were laid hands on and imprisoned, divers fled over seas, sundry most captious and calumnious questions and demands were devised to entangle men; as, namely, whether a king of one year old were not as truly a king as at forty or fifty, which if you did grant concerning the title and right of his crown (which is true), then presently they inferred, that King Edward, being but nine years old, wanting yet discretion, might also be lawful head of the church, and determine controversies of religion, yea, change the faith and religion which his father, and all his ancestors, kings and princes of England, all parliaments, synods, and councils before his days had left unto him for the space of a thousand years and more. And albeit he had not sufficient judgment to understand what religion meant, yet was he made judge thereof, by virtue of his birth and succession to the crown. And this point was wonderfully urged by the Protector, Lord Seymour, to all preachers, prelates, and bishops of that time, that they should inculcate the same to the people in their sermons, to the end that himself taking all the said child-king's authority upon him, might be head and judge in his place." These are Father Persons's words in the book of " Three Conversions," wherein we see nothing affirmed of that which Mr. Sutcliffe objected, that the children of kings are not to succeed their fathers in their kingdoms, but rather expressly the contrary, for that he granteth it to be true, that a king of one year old is as truly king as at forty or fifty, but yet not of sufficient judgment to change, alter, establish, or determine matters of religion, whereat it is known that the Protector, Lord Seymour, did principally level at that time. So as this is so far off from blasphemy in Father Persons, as it proveth it to be a mere false and slanderous accusation in Mr. Sutcliffe. And albeit I began to grow very weary to pass any further in recital and confutation of these kind of objections; yet there are so many that do offer

A mere cabil
and slander.

* Three Convers. p. 256.

themselves, as to a few more I must yet just give place, though with some loathsomeness and regret of stomach.

20. In his page, then, 135 he giveth this charge upon Father Persons for calumny and false allegation, that, page 192 of his "Three Conversions," he saith that *St. German prayed largely to St. Alban*; but, saith Mr. Sutcliffe, *Bede, upon whose credit this report is made, saith not so, as we may read, lib. 1, cap. 18, Anglorum Historiæ*; which charge, though it be in few words, and so obscurely set down that the common reader will hardly be able to understand or guess what truth or falsehood it hath in it, or of what matter it treateth, yet if you go to the place cited in Father Persons's book, or St. Bede's, you will wonder what Mr. Sutcliffe meant, to bring in this objection so contrary and prejudicial to himself. For that Father Persons, having occasion to speak of the going into Britany of St. German with his fellows, in the time of the Britons (before any of our English nation were christened), to deliver them from the Pelagian heresy, setteth down out of Bede,* in sundry chapters of his first book of History, sundry particular things that he did there; as, namely, how he cured a Tribune's daughter of blindness, by applying unto her certain relics of saints that he had brought out of France with him; how afterward he went and prayed at the sepulchre of St. Alban, and that this was in the venerable days of Lent, saith St. Bede. So as here all is verified that Father Persons affirmed. And to the end you may see to what straits Mr. Sutcliffe is brought in citing this eighteenth chapter of the first book of Bede's History,† as though it made for him, I shall set down the very words of Bede in that place, who having recounted the foresaid miracle, writeth thus: *Sacerdotes beatum Albanum martyrem, &c.*—"The priests (to wit, St. German, St. Lupus, and St. Severus) having wrought the former miracle, went to St. Alban the Martyr, to give thanks to God by him: where St. German, having with him the relics of all the apostles and of divers martyrs, after he had made prayer at the sepulchre, commanded the same

St. German's
visitation of
St. Alban's
relics.

* Bede, lib. 1, Hist. c. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.

† Bed. l. 11, c. 18.

to be opened, meaning to place there some of the said precious gifts, thinking it a good opportunity to place together in the participation of the selfsame sepulchre the relics of saints collected out of divers regions, whom now heaven hath made equal in glory; which relics being honourably there placed, and accompanied with the rest, he took with him into France a part of the dust where St. Alban's blood was shed," &c. So St. Bede. And by this we may learn to know the truth of Mr. Sutcliffe's objections, even when he faceth out the matters most, and citeth the very books and chapters of authors, where himself is most plainly confuted.

21. Another charge against Father Persons ^{Eighteenth charge.} is made by Mr. Sutcliffe, page 136 of his "Subversion," accusing him to say, *that all the Archbishops of Canterbury* (being about seventy in number), *from St. Augustine to Cranmer, were of one religion, and so continued for the space of almost a thousand years together, notwithstanding all other temporal changes, alterations, and innovations, which fell out to be very great in that time and kingdom.** And how think you doth Mr. Sutcliffe impugn this? Only by saying, *that hardly shall he prove that all of them* (to wit, those archbishops) *had any religion in them at all.* Which, besides the manifest calumnation, seemeth also to be a ridiculous objection, not improving at all that they succeeded not the one the other in profession at least of one and the selfsame faith, which is as much as Father Persons in the place alleged avowed, to prove thereby the continuance of one external religion for so many years together. And now, though I be full weary of these childish objections, as before I have complained, yet must I desire the reader to have patience to hear two or three more only in this kind, which be worthy indeed of Mr. Sutcliffe's menacing works of "Subversion" of his adversary.

22. The first is, that whereas Father Persons, in his book of "Three Conversions,"† ^{Nineteenth objection.} going about to defend our English saint and Archbishop of York and apostle of Sussex, St. Wilfrid, from the slander of John Bale, who wrote that for his wickedness he

* Three Convers. 283.

† Ibid. p. 64.

was driven out of his said archbishopric, Father Persons writeth thus thereof: *I have no better means present (saith he) than to oppose against this one lying apostate the universal consent of all antiquity, especially those that wrote his life, as St. Bede, and, after him, Hediús, Odo, Fridégonus, Petrus Blesensis, and others, who have written both his life and death, as of a great saint. And his memory and festival celebration is held throughout the universal church upon the 12th day of October, as all martyrologists do testify. And thus much of the insolency of John Bale against the person of St. Wilfrid. Upon which words Mr. Sutcliffe saith thus:** *He telleth how Wilfrid's festival day is kept by the universal church upon the 12th of October; but his leasing is plainly confuted by the calendars of the eastern and African churches that never knew of any such saint, and Molanus signifieth that this saint's feast was only kept in England: In Anglia (saith he) natalis Wilfridi.* So he. In whose words you see two arguments to reprove that which Father Persons affirmed of the festival celebration of St. Wilfrid to be held throughout the universal church: the first is by the calendars of the Eastern and African church; which calendars, notwithstanding, Mr. Sutcliffe produceth not, nor any of them; whereas Father Persons alleged divers ancient authors, whose names you have heard, for the sanctity of St. Wilfrid. And albeit the calendars of the eastern and African churches should not make any mention thereof; yet the western Latin church, having the feast in the public Roman "Martyrology," is sufficient to verify his saying. So as this argument seemeth rather a fond brag or cavil than an argument indeed.

A childish cavillation about the feast of St. Wilfrid.

23. But the second is more ridiculous, in that he goeth about to prove that St. Wilfrid's day was only kept in England, for that Molanus, in his notes upon the "Martyrology" of Usuardus, hath these words: *In Anglia natalis S. Wilfridi, Episcopi Eboracensis et Confessoris*—"In England is the birthday of St. Wilfrid, Bishop of York and Confessor." In citing of which words, Mr. Sutcliffe first, to disgrace St. Wilfrid,

* Subv. p. 133.

leaveth out the name of saint, bishop, and confessor, which words are in the "Martyrology," and then inferreth, that forsomuch as Molanus saith, *In Anglia natalis, &c.*, his meaning is, that in no other place but in England his festivity was kept: which is too childish, and must needs make all his readers to laugh at him. For that when the books of martyrologies do name the place of the birthday (to wit, the day of death or deposition) of any saint, they mean that there the saint died or was born, if the nativity be celebrated, and not that only in that place his festival memory is celebrated. For so (to confute Mr. Sutcliffe by his own author) the book of Molanus, cited by him upon the said 12th day of October, beginneth thus: *Apud Ravennam via Laurentina natalis S. Edistii, martyris*—"At the city of Ravenna, in the way called Laurentina, is the birthday of St. Edistius, martyr;" and the same hath the Roman "Martyrology," as also St. Bede and others; and yet no man that knoweth what he saith will say or write that the festival memory of this martyr is only celebrated in the city of Ravenna, or in the highway Laurentina by Ravenna; as, in like manner, upon the 26th of December, all martyrologists have, *Hierosolymis natalis St. Stephani Protomartyris*; and upon the day following, *Apud Ephesum natalis S. Joannis Apostoli et Evangelistæ*. And the day before them again, *In Bethleem Judæ nascitur Christus*; and yet no man will say, besides Mr. Sutcliffe, that either the festival day of St. Stephen was or is only celebrated in Jerusalem, or that of St. John the Evangelist in Ephesus, or that of Christ our Saviour in Bethlehem and nowhere else. And here I marvel what Mr. Sutcliffe will reply for excuse of so gross an error.

Mr. Sutcliffe
convinced of
absurdity.

24. But now the second instance about the selfsame saint is more gross and absurd than the former (if I be not deceived); for whereas Father Persons, in his book, had shewed out of Bede, in divers places of his works,* what a rare man St. Wilfrid was, *doctissimus vir* (saith Bede), and bishop at one time both of York and Lindis-serne, and apostle of the South Saxons, for that he con-

* Bede, lib. 3, Hist. c. 25; l. 4, c. 3 et 14.

verted them to the Christian faith; to all this Mr. Sutcliffe replieth in this manner: * *He sheweth* (quoth he) *how Wilfrid converted the South Saxons, which is as far from his purpose as the north from the south; for that in all this dispute he undertaketh to prove that the Britons were first converted to the Christian faith by Romans, and not by Frenchmen and Britons.* In which words of Mr. Sutcliffe, first, there be two plain falsities set down: the one that Father Persons undertaketh to prove that the Britons were first converted to the Christian faith by Romans, understanding by Romans, men of that nation, as it seemeth Mr. Sutcliffe doth, for that he opposeth the same to Frenchmen and Britons. For Father Persons's drift is only to shew that they were converted by men of the Roman faith, and not precisely of the Roman nation, which is evident; for that he setting down five apostles or apostolical men, recorded by divers histories to have preached Christian religion in Britany in the apostles' time, to wit, St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Symon of Canaan, St. Joseph of Arimathea, and St. Aristobulus,† only the last was a Roman by nation, but all of the Roman faith; and this is the first untruth, which I see not how it can be answered.

Twentieth objection.

25. The second untruth is, that Mr. Sutcliffe saith, that in all this dispute Father Persons undertaketh to prove that they were Romans, and no Frenchmen or Britons, that first converted Britany;

Two manifest falsities.

whereas the whole matter of this first conversion is handled only in the first and second chapters of the first part of his book of "Three Conversions," and consequently not throughout his whole dispute, nor anywhere at all throughout the said dispute or discourse, in that false sense which Mr. Sutcliffe proposeth it; for that, as hath been said, Father Persons had no intent to prove that the first converters were Romans by nation, but in religion only, as is evident by his plain words and whole discourse. And thus much of the two falsities or manifest untruths committed by Mr. Sutcliffe in this charge.

26. But now for the fondness of argument and infer-

* Subv. p. 141.

† Three Convers. p. 20—24.

ence here used by Mr. Doctor, I am ashamed in his behalf that such absurdity should come from him who desireth to retain the name of a learned man, for that the force of his reasoning is thus: that forsomuch as Father Persons did undertake to prove in the beginning of his book,* that Romans and not Frenchmen or Britons were the first converters of the ancient Britons to the Christian faith in the first ages after Christ; and after this † again affirmeth out of Bede,‡ that St. Wilfrid, being by birth a Saxon, converted the South Saxons, about six hundred years after that again, unto the same faith; this, saith Mr Sutcliffe, is as far from the purpose as the north from the south; signifying thereby that it is impertinent and contrary the one to the other: which is nothing so, if you consider it, nor hath it any least contradiction in itself, for that both the propositions of Father Persons may be true, and are true, according to the histories which he allegeth for the same; to wit, that some Britons might be converted by Romans, whether they were of the Roman religion or Roman nation, in the first age after Christ, and some Saxons might be converted by St. Wilfrid, an Englishman, six hundred years after that again, in the seventh age after Christ, as St. Bede and others do recount. And where then is there here north and south, impertinency and contradiction objected by Sutcliffe? Did he not want matter, trow you, when he endeavoureth to contradict his adversary with such absurdities of his own?

Fain imputations of contradictions where none are.

27. But the third and last in this kind, which here I mean to trouble the reader withal, exceedeth all the rest, as I may well say, in folly and lack of modesty, if not of piety; for whereas Father Persons, in the seventh chapter and first part of his book of "Three Conversions," doth lay forth at large the contempt and rejection used by the Magdeburgians, § in their history, against the greater part of all ancient fathers of the first four ages after Christ, censuring and condemning divers doctrines of theirs, which make altogether against

Twenty-first objection.

* Three Conv. c. 1, p. 19.

† Ibid. c. 3, p. 59.

‡ Bede, l. 3, c. 25; l. 4, c. 3, A.D. 677, 678.

§ Centur. 2, c. 4, p. 65.

the Protestants and their religion in sundry points now in controversy, he bringeth sundry examples out of their writings, how they handled St. Ignatius, the scholar of St. John the Evangelist, for treating of the Lenten fast, and of consecrating virgins unto Christ, and other like points. Father Persons's words of the latter point are these.

28. "About the consecrating of virgins to Christ (saith he) the Magdeburgians mislike greatly certain speeches of St. Ignatius: as, for example, *Epistola ad Antiochen: Virgines vident cui se consecrarint*—'Let virgins consider well to whom they have consecrated themselves.'"* And again, *Epistola ad Tharsen: Eas quæ in virginitate sunt, honorate, sicut sacras Christo*—"Do you honour them that live in virginity, as consecrated unto Christ." And yet further, in his epistle *ad Heronem: Virgines custodi tamquam sacramenta Christi*—"Have care to keep the virgins as sacraments of Christ;" upon which last words Mr. Sutcliffe giveth this assault: † *He allegeth* (saith he) *an Epistle of Ignatius, ad Heronem, where he saith: Virgines custodi tamquam sacramenta Christi*—"Keep (or preserve) virgins as the sacraments of Christ:" but this sheweth (saith he) *that there are more sacraments than seven, which no Papist dare affirm unless he will incur the thundering curse of the conventicle of Trent.* And is not this a learned inference against the number of seven sacraments? or is it not rather a most immodest cavil? For who doth not see by the former alleged words of St. Ignatius, that he meant not sacraments properly, but of *res consecratæ Christo*, and thereby made *sacræ*, "sacred things," by their consecration to Christ? And I do willingly pretermit that other scurrilous speech used here by Mr. Sutcliffe, but unfit for modest ears or tongues, *that these sacraments are oftentimes begotten with child, &c.*

29. And this shall be sufficient, if not overmuch, of these assaults and charges, which may be termed *impertinent, vain, idle, captious, and ridiculous.* Now we shall pass to other, that may seem more malicious and wilfully false, objected against the same book of "Three Conversions,"

* Three Convers. p. 145.

† Subv. p. 142.

albeit many of these already rehearsed have not wanted their voluntary falsehood also, as now you have seen. And albeit I am extreme loath, as often before I have complained, to wade any further in this ungrateful subject of Mr. Sutcliffe falsely objecting falsehood to others, and of lies committed in charging others with lies, which yet, for that it concerneth the person, which it doth, whose sincerity or untruth in manner of writing so much imported me to know, as by the beginning of this narration I have declared, I shall here entertain myself for one chapter more upon the examination of the second sort of Mr. Sutcliffe's objected untruths, or rather of his untruths committed in objecting untruths to Father Persons.

CHAPTER VIII.

The same subject is continued of objecting Lies and Falsifications by Mr. Sutcliffe against Father Persons's Book of "Three Conversions;" which Objections are found to have more malice and wilful falsities than the former.

I HAVE advertised thee before, gentle reader, how much I have been grieved to see such trifling and impertinent objections made by Mr. Sutcliffe in a matter so weighty as is the charge of lying, corrupting, falsifying, forging, and imputation of blasphemy, atheism, and other like heinous crimes pretended in the titles of his chapters, and proclaimed over the heads of all his pages; but yet I must confess that when I found the same objections made, not only without cause or substantial proof, but also with evident and inexcusable falsehood and witting deceit in the objector, I was more moved and scandalized therewith, especially forsomuch as I found Mr. Sutcliffe so often to protest seriously his hatred of all falsehood in like points. For thus he beginneth his fourteenth chapter, entitled of Falsifications, False Allegations, Corruptions of Fathers, &c.

2. *In civil causes (saith he), to deal untruly is falsity; but in matters of faith, to use false dealing doth, beside falsity, imply impiety;* * which, when I read, I began to hope that I should find some true dealing in him for the time to come.

But soon after I fell upon divers places that bereaved me of this hope again. As, for example, page 125 of his book, he giveth this great charge against Father Persons, that he, speaking of the Popish doctrine of sacraments, saith: "There can be no doubt thereof." And

first objection.

* Subv. p. 110.

why, trow you (saith Mr. Sutcliffe); forsooth because the conventicle of Trent, the Master of Sentences, and Thomas of Aquin, have taught it; I would therefore pray all moderate men (quoth he) *attentively to consider this fellow's either madness or ignorance: we do by arguments out of Scriptures and fathers refute the impious doctrine of the conventicle of Trent, Lombard, and Aquinas, and he thinketh it sufficient by the testimony of his own fellows most partially deposing in their own cause to refute our arguments grounded upon Scriptures, fathers, and other authentical witnesses.** So he.

Great ostentation of Mr. Sutcliffe.

3. And, truly, when I had considered well of these his words, and conferred them with the place itself, cited out of the "Three Conversions,"† it seemed to me that I discovered madness rather of passion and want of remorse of conscience in Mr. Sutcliffe than lack of wit or understanding. For I found Father Persons to have nothing of that which here is objected, but a clear different discourse, wherein Mr. Sutcliffe himself must needs agree with him; for that Father Persons, shewing how hard a thing it had been, or rather impossible, for those of his side to have brought into the church and made to be generally received seven sacraments (for example, if Christ and his apostles had left but two), writeth thus:‡ *But yet further* (saith he) *to all this may be added another consideration of no small weight, which is the difficulty of bringing in certain doctrines, if any would have attempted it; as, for example, the doctrine of seven sacraments, if there had been but two only before in the apostles' time: it had been an extreme great novelty to have added five more, which never would have been admitted without much strife and resistance, seeing all Catholics* (and I think all Protestants in like manner) *do hold that Christ only could institute sacraments, for that he only could assure the promise of grace made thereunto, as excellently doth declare the Council of Trent, § and long before that again the Master of Sentences. || And St. Thomas, in the name of all Catholics, did leave that doctrine registered; and there can be no doubt thereof. ¶*

* Subv. p. 125.

§ Sess. 7, c. 1.

† Three Convers. p. 119.

|| 4 Dist. 5, q. 10, art. 2.

‡ Ibid. p. 118.

¶ Part 3, q. 64, art. 4.

Mr. Sutcliffe's
wilful mistak-
ing his adver-
sary.

4. Lo, here Father Persons saith not there can be no doubt of the doctrine or number of seven sacraments, or other points in controversy between Protestants and them, as Mr. Sutcliffe accuseth him to say, and much less doth he allege for his reason that the Council of Trent, the Master of Sentences, and St. Thomas have determined the same, and consequently doth oppose them and their authorities against arguments, Scriptures, and fathers alleged by Protestants; but his purpose is to prove that if there had been but two sacraments known and acknowledged in the apostles' time, it had been impossible to institute or bring in other five afterward, for this principal reason, for that all divines, without exception, of his side, do hold and affirm as a general received doctrine, principle, and *maxim*, that all the church together hath not power to make or institute a sacrament that was not instituted by Christ himself; for that the said church hath not power to annex the promise of grace thereunto, which maketh the essence of a sacrament. And for this last point he citeth both the Council of Trent, St. Thomas, and Master of Sentences, and consequently saith that, the matter being so generally determined and received, there can be no doubt among Catholics thereof, to wit, of this point (of power in the church to institute sacraments); he doth not say, there can be no doubt of matters in controversy between Protestants and them, as falsely Mr. Sutcliffe accuseth him, but in the foresaid point only, wherein Protestants and Mr. Sutcliffe himself do and must needs agree with Papists in this, that no authority of man hath power to institute any sacrament for the reasons aforesaid.

5. Now, then, what shall I say of Mr. Sutcliffe's entreating all moderate men attentively to consider Father Persons's madness or ignorance, in saying there can be no doubt of this matter among Catholics, forsomuch as he might have said in like manner among Protestants? Can there be greater madness, or at leastwise more wilful folly, than to object that to his adversary which is not only not said by him, but evidently also held and confessed by him-

self to be true, and therewith to pray the reader to stand attent to see and discern where the madness is? Truly, in my opinion, there is no moderate and discreet man but will condemn Mr. Sutcliffe of little less than madness in this behalf; for, as for ignorance, I will not name, as not likely to have transported him in this matter, wherein there are so many falsities that must needs be presumed wilful, as no place is left to ignorance.

6. There ensueth in his page 111 of "Ob-
jections," in these words: *Persons saith, that* Second objec-
tion.
Eleutherius converted King Lucius by the preaching of Da-
manianus and his fellows; and for proof allegeth Bede, lib.
1, Histor. cap. 17 et 18. But Bede, in these two chapters,
doth not so much as once mention any such matter. So
Mr. Sutcliffe; and thinketh thereby to have taken Father
Persons at a great advantage; and, although it be a mat-
ter of small moment, for the printer to miss, in citing of
chapters by ciphers, as it here falleth out, where 17 and
18 is put for 27 and 28; yet, to use so apparent shifting
falsehoods, as here Mr. Sutcliffe, in divers points, doth,
seemed to me an indignity not tolerable in a man of his
calling. For, if you resort to Father Persons's book and
page here cited,* you shall find that he doth not at all
cite Bede in this place for the conversion of King Lucius
by Eleutherius, though he mention the same, About the con-
versions of
King Lucius
and King
Ethelbert.
but only for the conversion of King Ethelbert,
and the English Saxons by St. Augustine and
his fellow preachers four hundred years after
the other, as is evident both by the text and margin,
where the citation is set down, which Mr. Sutcliffe could
not but manifestly see. And as for the conversion of King
Lucius, Father Persons handled it afterwards in his fourth
chapter, page 77, citing Bede for the same, *lib. 1, Hist.*
cap. 4, and another book, *de Sex Ætatibus, sub Antonino*
Vero, and divers other authors, as Ado, Marianus Scotus,
and Polidore; and in this former place only citeth Bede
for the third conversion of England, under Pope Gregory,
as hath been said.

* Three Convers. p. 3. [Ed. 1603.]

7. And whereas Father Persons's printed book hath in the margin, *Bed. l. 1, Hist. cap. 17, 18, &c.*, which should have been, as I said, 27, 28, &c., Mr. Sutcliffe craftily dissembleth, first the error of the printer, though he saw all set down at large, which Father Persons alleged in the said 27th and 28th chapters of the same book, and then striketh out the particle "&c.," which would presently have directed the reader to the 27th and 28th chapters, and have detected the said error of the printer. For that Bede doth continue his speech of his third conversion for eleven or twelve chapters together, after the 27th and 28th; whereas after the 17th and 18th there is nothing concerning that matter. Here then appeareth triple or quadruple wilful deceit: first, in mistaking the second conversion of England under Eleutherius for the third under Pope Gregory; then in saying that Father Persons alleged Bede for the former, whereas he expressly alleged him for the latter; thirdly, in deceiving his reader with urging the 17th and 18th chapters, which he must needs know to be an error of the printer, instead of 27, 28; and, fourthly, in striking out the particle "&c.," that must needs have directed the reader to discover the said error, and find out the matter truly alleged by his adversary. And none of those escapes could be of ignorance, but of set will and purpose. What shall we then say of Mr. Dean in this behalf? Is it not almost atheism to call him a good prelate or a true preaching dean?

Four wilful
falsities toge-
ther.

Third objec-
tion.

8. Another charge is in page 112 of Mr. Sutcliffe's book, where he accuseth Father Persons for citing falsely, as he saith, Cyprian's testimony, *lib. 2, Epist. 3*; for proof of his massing sacrifice, and cutting out certain words of the midst of the sentence; but he doth not tell his reader that himself dealeth falsely and deceitfully herein, accusing Father Persons for that which he well knew not to be his fault, if any were, but of his own brethren the Magdeburgians, whom he concealeth; for that Father Persons, laying forth the demeanour of the said Magdeburgian Protestants in disgracing the ancient fathers of every age, where in matters of controversy

they make against them, hath these words in the first part of his "Three Conversions."* *And in the third age [after Christ] (saith he) the Magdeburgians do accuse that blessed bishop and martyr St. Cyprian of superstition, for saying, Sacerdotem vice Christi fungi et Deo Patri sacrificium offerre—"That the priest doth supply the place of Christ, and doth offer sacrifice to God the Father."* Which are the very words punctually taken out of the Magdeburgians,† without any addition or taking away of any thing by Father Persons; and yet writeth Mr. Sutcliffe thus of Father Persons: *He citing (saith he) Cyprian's testimony, lib. 2, Epist. 3, cutteth off these words out of the midst of the sentence, Qui id quod Christus fecit, imitatur—"that the Christian priest, when he sacrificeth, doth imitate that which Christ himself did."*

9. But why should Mr. Sutcliffe, if this made any thing for his purpose, as it doth not, but rather much against him, as now shall be shewed, —why, I say, should he accuse Father Persons and not the Magdeburgians hereof; he knowing and seeing, if he looked upon the place, that they are their words and their proper citation of St. Cyprian, and not of Father Persons? Or, why should he not so much as once name the Magdeburgians in all this objection? Truth it is, that in St. Cyprian's text these other words also are mentioned here by Mr. Sutcliffe, for thus he saith: *Utique ille sacerdos vice Christi verè fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur, et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesia Deo Patri si sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse ‡—"That priest doth truly exercise the function of Christ which doth imitate that which Christ did, and then doth he offer in the church a true and full sacrifice to God the Father, if he begin so to offer as he seeth Christ himself to have offered."* Which words, indeed, in St. Cyprian are more effectual than as they are cited by the Magdeburgians, who yet, if they had thought that the sleight or evasion used here by Mr. Sutcliffe had been sufficient

Fraudulent dealing in concealing the Magdeburgians.

A sleight in Mr. Sutcliffe.

* Three Convers. p. 9.

† Centur. 3, c. 4, p. 83.

‡ Cypr. lib. 2, Ep. 3, et sec. Pamelium, Ep. 63.

to shift off the place, they would never have taken that other course to reprehend St. Cyprian, as they do, for speaking in such manner and so plainly for the sacrifice of the church, they being no less enemies thereunto than English Protestants. But surely I could blush in Mr. Sutcliffe's behalf in urging so earnestly this matter against Father Persons without once naming the Magdeburgians, unto whom only the matter appertained; and next that he will bring in a matter so prejudicial to his own doctrine for mass and sacrifice as this place of St. Cyprian is.

Fourth objection.

10. Another shift of Mr. Sutcliffe I find page 112, where, going about to answer an allegation of Father Persons out of Eusebius's "Chronicle," translated out of Greek by St. Jerome, where, upon the forty-fourth year of Christ, these words are set down, related by Father Persons: *Petrus apostolus, natione Galilæus, Christianorum pontifex primus, &c.**—"Peter the apostle, of the country of Galilee, the first chief bishop of Christians, after he had founded the church of Antioch, went to Rome, and, having preached there the Gospel, remained bishop of the same city for twenty-five years together," &c. So Eusebius. And this doth Mr. Sutcliffe impute, among his falsifications and corruptions of fathers, to Father Persons, whereas, notwithstanding, the words are punctually to be found in Eusebius's "Chronicle," as he allegeth them. But what shift hath Mr. Sutcliffe, think you, to calumniate the same? Forsooth, he useth an equivocation, saying, *Neither doth Eusebius in his story, nor any other good author, say, that Peter sat Bishop of Rome twenty-five years together.* But to the first of these two points may be answered, that Father Persons alleged not the "Story" of Eusebius, but his "Chronicle," as you have heard; and Mr. Sutcliffe would deceive his reader, who, knowing not the difference between Eusebius's large "Story" and brief "Chronicle," being two different works, he would make him believe that Eusebius hath it not at all.

Mr. Sutcliffe useth an equivocation to deceive.

* Eusebius, in Chron. an. Christi 44.

11. And as for the second, that no other good author avoucheth the same, I remit him to his former antagonists, Bellarmine* and Baronius,† who will teach him where to find sundry. And for that I suppose he will not deny St. Jerome to be a good author, I shall entreat him to read what he writeth of St. Peter in this behalf, in his book *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis: Petrus secundo Claudii anno Romam pergit, ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit, usque ad ultimum annum Neronis* ‡—“Peter, in the second year of Claudius the Emperor, went to Rome, and there held the priestly chair for twenty-five years, until the last year of the Emperor Nero.” So that Jerome and other authors are named by Bellarmine, as holding the foresaid number of twenty-five years that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome,§ Damasus, Isidorus, Beda, Freulphus, Ado Viennensis, Ado Trevirensis, Marianus Scotus, and some others. And now, what will Mr. Sutcliffe answer to this unfaithful dealing, wherein by so many ways he endeavoureth to deceive his reader? I am sorry he did not remember that saying of his, which I observed in the beginning of this paragraph: *In matters of faith to use false dealing doth, besides falsity, imply impiety.* But let us go forward.

12. In the same page, 122, he accuseth Father Persons as a falsary for alleging certain testimonies out of St. Ambrose for transubstantiation. *He maketh Ambrose to say* (quoth Mr. Sutcliffe) *that the substance of one body is changed into another; but that holy father hath no such words as this falsary hath reported out of his writings.*|| Which seemed unto me a strange charge and asseveration; forsomuch as, repairing to Father Persons's book, I found the very words of St. Ambrose set down out of sundry parts of his works to this effect of transmutation of natures by force of consecration.¶ As, for example (saith he), St. Ambrose, speaking of the words of Christ in the consecration: *Non valebit*

* Bellar. l. 2, De Pontif. Rom.

† Baron. tom. 1, Annal. A. D. 44.

‡ Hieron. De Srip. Eccl. in Petro.

§ How then do many Protestants avouch St. Peter was never there?

|| Subv. p. 112.

¶ Three Convers. p. 111.

sermo Christi ut species mutet elementorum?—"Shall not the words of Christ be of power to change the natures of elements?" And again: *Sermo Christi qui potuit de nihilo facere quod non erat, non potest ea quæ sunt in id mutare quod non erat?*—"The speech of Christ that was able to create of nothing that which was not before, shall it not be able to change things that are already into that which they were not before?"* He meaneth the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, as himself doth expound.

The real presence affirmed by St. Ambrose.

13. Thus Father Persons in that place out of St. Ambrose, in his books *De Sacramentis*.

And I myself, repairing to St. Ambrose by this occasion, found that in other places also of his works he affirmeth the very same. As, for example, in his book, *De iis qui initiantur, &c.*, he hath these words: *Quantis utimur exemplis, ut probemus, &c.*—"How many examples do we use to prove that the thing remaineth not (after the words of consecration) that which nature did frame, but that which the benediction did consecrate: and that greater is the force of the benediction than of nature, *quia benedictione etiam natura ipsa mutatur*—"for that nature itself also is changed by the benediction." So St. Ambrose.† And now, what shall we say of Mr. Sutcliffe, that is not ashamed not only to accuse Father Persons as a falsary for alleging these words,

which stand truly and wholly in St. Ambrose, as he hath alleged them, but avoucheth further that this holy father had no such words; by what figure of speech, think you, will he shift off this absurdity, or excuse it from wilful calumnation, but only, as I said, by some equivocation, and that of the worst sort, whereof we have seen divers examples proposed in a late treatise to Mr. Morton of that matter? but many more might the author have found in only Mr. Sutcliffe than all the rest there cited, if I be not deceived.

Sixth objection.

14. But there followeth; within few pages after again, such a notorious falsification and

* Ambr. l. 4, De Sacramentis.

† [Tome iii. 422.]

abusing of his reader as may cause any man to stomach the matter that hath any least liking or affection to truth and sincerity. For thus he writeth against Father Persons: *To prove (saith he) the word mass, he allegeth Augustine, Sermon 237 et 251, De Tempore; Concilium Milevitanum, cap. 12; Epiphanius, Hæres. 50; Euseb. lib. 5, Hist. cap. 33, et De Vita Constantini, lib. 3, cap. 17; et Concil. Carthag. 4, cap. 84; but, first, Eusebius and Epiphanius are grossly belied. For how could they, writing in Greek, speak of the Latin mass?** So he. And it might seem that he had taken Father Persons at a gross advantage, indeed, if for the Latin word *mass* he had cited Greek authors; but he that shall read the place itself in Father Persons's book of "Three Conversions" will marvel exceedingly at such manner of dealing; for that he citeth not these two Greek authors for proof of the word *mass*, but to prove the use of Easter, after the fashion of the Jews, to have been condemned and held for an error and heresy, after the time of the first Council of Nice. For better demonstration of which egregious false dealing in Mr. Sutcliffe, I will here set down the words as they lie in Father Persons's book, who having cited a place out of old Gildas, for the use of saying masses in our country of Britany during his days, he addeth these words.†

Egregious
false dealing
in Mr. Sut-
cliffe.

15. "Thus wrote Gildas (saith he) of altars and sacrifice among the Britons in those days, and divers other points like unto this, which, for brevity's sake, I omit. Only I would ask our men in general, whether this be spoken as of Protestants or no? And then would I demand of John Fox in particular, how that can be true, which he affirmeth, that the Britons had no mass in those days, seeing Gildas talked so much of priests that did sacrifice upon altars? And if he will say that Gildas useth not the word *mass*, it is a plain cavil, seeing nothing is signified by the mass but only the external sacrifice of Christians here mentioned. And that the word *mass* was generally used in the Latin Church for sacrifice long be-

* Sutcliffe, p. 117.

† Three Convers. p. 187.

fore this time of Gildas, appeareth by many authors, but especially by St. Augustine, the doctor, in divers places of his works, whereof some in the margin we shall note."

16. So he; noting in the margin* five places for St. Augustine's authority therein, for the use of the word *mass*, partly in his own works and partly out of the councils of his days, wherein himself was present. And then, leaving that matter, he passeth to another, saying thus: "I would ask also of John Bale, how the religion of the Britons was the pure and naked Gospel in those days, (for so he saith it was,) if it had in it not only that custom of the Jews, before mentioned, of the *Quartadecimani*, but all those other points in like manner, which his church accounteth for error, to wit, of professed monks, of consecrated nuns, of sacrificing upon altars, and the like;" for all which he citeth *Gildas de Excid. Britan. cap. 26, &c.* And about this point of the error of the *Quartadecimani*, he citeth in the margin † the two Greek authors, Epiphanius and Eusebius, that in the places quoted do make mention of the error of the *Quartadecimani* or *Paschiti*.

17. But Mr. Sutcliffe, to seem to have somewhat against Father Persons, beginneth first to refute that the Greek authors could not make mention of the Latin word *mass*, himself well knowing that they were not alleged for that at all; but yet, secondly, is to be noted another deceitful trick, worse than the former. For whereas in Father Persons's margin the said *Latin* authorities are set together, as appertaining to prove the word *mass*, and distinguished from the rest by a star, both in the margin and the text, as here also is expressed; and the *Greek* authors are quoted after by themselves severally as belonging to the other matter; Mr. Sutcliffe, to dazzle his reader's eyes, doth of purpose disorder the squadron in his citation, cutting off, first, out of the Latin authorities, *Concil. Carthag. Secundum, cap. 3*; and then, for the fourth Coun-

* Aug. tom. 10, Serm. 237 et 251, De Temp. et in Conc. Milevit. c. 12, et Carthag. 2, c. 3, et Conc. Carth. 4, c. 84, quibus interluit August.

† Epiphan. Heres. 50; Euseb. l. 5, Histor. c. 23; et in Vita Constant. l. 3, c. 17.

cil of Carthage, cap. 84, that immediately did ensue, he placeth it last of all, *after two Greek authors*, to hedge them in belike that they should not fly from him, as you may see in his citation before alleged. And now if any man can play better his prize than this, in falsifying and cozening his reader, even then when he objecteth falsification to others, I, for my part, will judge him the game.

18. In the very same page he writeth of Father Persons thus: *He saith, page 228, that* Seventh objection.
Irenæus accounteth the enumeration of the Bishops of Rome a full proof against heretics; but he abuseth this holy father and beliet him, for of this full proof he hath not one word. But when I went and read the words in Father Persons's book, I could not but remain astonished, for he setteth down the very words of Irenæus, who, having made an enumeration (saith Father Persons)* of all the Bishops of Rome for proof of a Catholic succession and tradition against the heretics of his days, from Peter downward to Pope Eleutherius, that lived with him, he inferred this conclusion: *Est plenissima hæc ostensio unam et eandem vivificatricem fidem esse, quæ in ecclesiis ab apostolis et conservata, et tradita in unitate, &c.*†—"This is a most full proof that one and the selfsame lively faith hath been conserved in the church from the apostles' days unto our time, delivered from one to another in unity." So saith Irenæus. And now, if *plenissima ostensio* be a most full proof, then is it in Irenæus, nor may Father Persons truly be said to abuse or belie him, as Mr. Sutcliffe accuseth; and, on the contrary side, himself avouching, as here he doth, that of this full proof Irenæus hath not one word, is evidently convinced of wilful falsehood indeed, *plenissima ostensione*, with a most full proof of the text itself.

19. It would be excessive long to prosecute all his objections in this kind, whereof no one, Eighth objection. that hitherto I can find, proveth any wilful untruth or falsity against his adversary, but against himself very many,

* Three Convers. p. 278.

† Iren. lib. 3, Advers. Hæres. cap. 4.

if not all. And I must be enforced to put many together for abbreviation of this matter. He accuseth, therefore, Father Persons yet further of falsification in the selfsame page, and the very next charge, for that in his book of "Three Conversions," page 278, he allegeth a place out of St. Augustine, in his "Epistle against Faustus, the Manichee," for the succession of Roman bishops, saying that St. Augustine maketh it a principal motive of his own remaining in the Catholic Church: *whereas* (saith Mr. Sutcliffe) *that holy father reckoneth that among and after others, and no way accounteth it a mark of the church*: but this objection is as good as the former, to wit, a very cavil; for that the very words alleged by Father Persons are expressly to be found in the place of St. Augustine, by him quoted; for thus he writeth: *Tenet me in ecclesia ubi ipsa Petri sede usque ad præsentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum, &c.**—"I am held in this church (against all sectaries) by the succession of priests and bishops, that have come down from the seat of St. Peter, the apostle, to the present Bishop of Rome, Anastasius, that holdeth the seat at this day." So far St. Augustine. And what falsification, then, is there here on Father Persons's side, when both words and sense of St. Augustine are truly by him alleged? Nor doth Father Persons so much as name any mark of the church in that place, nor allegeth St. Augustine to that end, albeit the said succession be otherwise held by that father for a mark of the now Catholic Church. What manner of dealing then is this? What knots are these sought in rushes, as the proverb is? Doth not Mr. Sutcliffe know that the accusation of a lie returneth upon the accuser with a double sin if it cannot be proved; for that not only falsehood, but malice also, is therein contained? I marvel the Dean and Doctor would be so much overseen, or rather be carried away with passion. But let us proceed.

Ninth objection.

20. In the very next line † after this charge he giveth another out of the selfsame father, accusing Father Persons to have alleged falsely St. Au-

* Aug. Ep. cont. Faust. Manich. c. 4, tom. 6.

† Subv. p. 117.

gustine's testimony for the succession of the Church of Rome. Page 282 (saith he) of his "*Three Conversions*," St. Augustine, lib. de Utilitate Credendi, c. 7, is alleged by him for proof of the succession of the Church of Rome, but falsely, for that he speaketh of the succession of divers bishops in the whole Christian church, which overthroweth the pretended prerogative of the Roman Church. So Mr. Sutcliffe. But for answer to this, as to most of all the rest, it was sufficient for me to take a view of the page by him quoted in Father Persons's book, where, he having shewed out of St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and other authors,* what esteem they made of the succession of the Roman bishops for assurance of the truth of Catholic faith, he adjoineth also thereunto the testimony first of St. Jerome: *In illa ecclesia permanendum, quæ ab apostolis fundata usque ad diem hanc durat*†—"We must abide in that church (speaking of the Church of Rome) which being founded by the apostles endureth until this day." And then he adjoineth this other of St. Augustine: ‡ *Dubitabimus nos illius consedere gremio, quæ ab apostolica sede per successiones episcoporum (frustra hæreticis circumlatrantibus) culmen auctoritatis obtinuit*?—"Shall we doubt to rest in the lap of that church, which hath kept continually the height of authority by succession of bishops, from the see apostolic unto this day, notwithstanding the vain barkings of heretics on every side of her?"

21. These words are truly and sincerely alleged out of St. Augustine; and how then doth Mr. Sutcliffe say that they are falsely alleged? Why had he not proved it by something here set down, that it is not St. Augustine? For as for his reason that St. Augustine speaketh of the succession of divers bishops in the whole Christian church, it seemeth both untrue and impertinent.—Untrue, for that in this place St. Augustine mentioneth no other churches; and impertinent, for that if he had so done, yet doth not that take away the privilege of principality, or *culmen auctoritatis*, "the pre-eminence of authority," here mentioned by St. Augustine, as peculiar to the Church of

* Three Convers. p. 282.

† Hieron. Dialog. cont. Lucifer.

‡ Aug. l. De Utilitate Credendi, c. 17.

Rome above the rest. So that every one of these weak and feeble objections seems unto me not so much to strike the adversary as to wound the objector, and yet must the reader have patience to hear some few more.

Tenth objection.

22. There followeth in the very next page another objection of corrupting and falsifying St. Augustine laid against Father Persons by Mr. Sutcliffe, in these words. *Page 291 (saith he) of the same book, St. Augustine and other fathers are alleged to prove the church to be so visible that every man may see it and know it; but it seemeth that our adversary cited them at all adventure, for in some of these places little mention is made of the church, and in none of them is his intention proved.** This is his whole charge; but to me it seemed that Mr. Sutcliffe wrote at all adventures, for that Father Persons, in the place quoted, dealeth with no other fathers about the matter in hand but only St. Augustine, citing some nine or ten places out of divers parts of his works, whereof Mr. Sutcliffe hath cut off the far greater part in his objection, being grieved, perhaps, to see so many of that argument, and hath answered both the one and the other so slightly, as you have heard, that any child may weary or put to silence the learnedest man; that is, by such manner of answering. But let us hear, if you please, Father Persons's words as they lie in his book,† and then consider how Mr. Sutcliffe hath, according to the title of his book, subverted him by his answer.

23. "To allege fathers (saith Father Persons) and doctors in this behalf" (*for proving the visibility of the church*) "were both endless and needless, for that all of them everywhere almost are occupied in setting forth, not only the visibility, but the splendour also and greatness, yea, the multitude and external majesty of Christ's church throughout the world in their days. And only St. Augustine may serve for all,‡ who dilateth himself everywhere in this argument, shewing how the little stone prophesied by Da-

* Subv. p. 118.

† Three Convers. p. 290.

‡ See St. Aug. in Psal. xlv. et xlvii. ; and l. 2, contra Petil. c. 32 et 104; l. 2, contra Cresc. c. 36; and l. 4, c. 58, Tract 1 et 2, in Ep. Joan. ; and c. 4, Collat. 3 diei in Brevic.

niel was grown to be a huge mountain and terrible to the whole world; and that the tabernacle of Christ (which is his church) was placed by him in the sun to be seen of all; and that it was a city upon a mountain which none could be ignorant of: and other like discourses, founded on evident scriptures, whereby is refuted not only the first shift of Luther and Calvin making the true church of Christ invisible, but also the second of the later Lutherans, who (though overcome with the former proofs) do grant the church to be a visible company, yet do they deny it to be that external conspicuous succession of bishops and councils which have been most eminent in the known Christian church from the apostles downward; but rather to be some few obscure and contemptible people (which they call the elect) that have lived, or lurked from time to time in shadows and darkness, and known to few or none."

24. Thus far are Father Persons's words, with an ample citation of the places as here you see in the margin, which being abbreviated by Mr. Sutcliffe, gelding them, and answered as briefly and scoffingly, as out of his own words you have heard, every man will see that they are only shifted off by saying, that in some of these places little mention is made of the church, and that in none of them Father Persons's intention is proved. And who cannot answer wher? And why doth not he shew the places in particular wherein little mention is made of the church? I, for my part, having looked upon them, have found much, and would gladly have seen some sound answer of Mr. Doctor to some one or other of them, they being many and large, and very effectual discourses of St. Augustine to prove the visibility of the church; and yet, saith Mr. Sutcliffe, *in none of them is his intention proved*: which is only a summary speech, as you see. But yet, why should he accuse Father Persons here of falsification and false allegation of fathers, for citing these places, as they lie in the author? Is not this a great appetite of accusing in Mr. Sutcliffe?

25. But now further, two or three pages after this again, to wit, 122, he objecteth to Fa-

Poor and miserable manner of answering.

Evident objection.

ther Persons for a gross ignorance and childish foolery, that he telleth us (saith Mr. Sutcliffe) in his epistle before his book of "*Three Conversions*," how Constantine the Great entered into the empire next after Dioclesian; but ecclesiastical histories (saith he) do shew that Constantius and Galerius succeeded Dioclesian, and that Constantine succeeded his father Constantius; and if he will not believe us, let him see what Baronius saith in his second and third tome of "*Annales*;" who putteth three years between Dioclesian and Constantine, and others between them two. So he. But when I went to Baronius, as Mr. Sutcliffe appointed me, I found him to put two years only between them, for that Dioclesian resigned his empire in the year of Christ 304, and that Constantine began his in the year 306; which Baronius proveth by the authority of many ancient historiographers. And it is strange that Mr. Sutcliffe would affirm a thing so manifestly false, with such confidence, and remit his reader to the place where indeed he shall see him plainly refuted.

Is not this
worse than
childish
foolery in Mr.
Sutcliffe?

26. And this for the year, which little maketh to the purpose of the controversy itself, for whether it were two years, or three, or more, that Constantine succeeded Dioclesian, little importeth, but whether he succeeded him *next* or no: so as in this word *next* standeth the error of Father Persons's side, if any such thing were committed; albeit, it might excuse it, saying, that he meant the next emperor that impugned openly Dioclesian's persecution. But what if Father Persons hath not the word *next* at all, but that it be put in by Mr. Sutcliffe, to take thereby occasion to accuse him; is not this double iniquity, indeed? or, rather, doth not this imply impiety, according to his former protestation? Let us hear, then, Father Persons's own words, where, talking of his Majesty's coming to the crown, that now is of England, with hope of toleration to all, and mitigation of the former persecution of Catholics under Queen Elizabeth, he writeth thus:* *Here generally the applause is no otherwise than it was in old time among*

* In the "Addition to the Catholics."

the Christians upon the entrance of Constantine into the empire after Dioclesian, and of Jovinian after Julian. So he. And here you see is not the word *next* at all, nor was it his purpose, nor to his purpose, to shew that Constantine was the very next emperor that reigned after Dioclesian, but rather that he was the next that publicly relieved Christians after Dioclesian's persecution, wherein consisteth the whole force and drift of Father Persons's speech to his Majesty in that place; so as, indeed, I was greatly scandalized here to see a word thrust in to play upon by the accuser himself. And is this plain dealing, thought I, or possible to be found in a dean of so worthy a church as Exeter is? Surely, if I had seen this before how he dealeth in writing, I should scarce have believed him in pulpit or preaching.

27. Another objection he frameth, p. 118, in these words: *Bede's testimony* (saith he), lib. Twelfth objection. 3, c. 27, *is alleged by Persons, page 383, to prove the sending of Willebrord with his eleven companions towards the conversion of Germany, but (in Bede) the chapter being read, doth confute our adversary's falsehood.* So he. And no more. But here I cannot but marvel what falsehood or manner of confutation he meaneth: is it, perhaps, that Bede hath the contrary? Or not this which is set down? No, truly; for Father Persons, in the page of his book here cited, declaring what great zeal our old English Saxon Christians had, after their own conversion, to preach the Christian faith in divers parts of Germany, hath these words: * "Willebrord was sent out of England with his eleven companions towards the conversion of Germany, by the holy abbot, St. Egbert, as both St. Bede and other authors after him do testify." And for this he citeth, in his margin, Bede, both in his third book and twenty-seventh chapter, as also in his fifth book and twenty-third chapter: for that, in the first place, Bede maketh mention of the beginning of the holiness of St. Egbert, that was author afterward of that mission, and in the fifth book he recounteth both the mission at large in his eleventh chapter, and the death of the said holy abbot, St. Egbert, in

* Three Convers. p. 383.

the twenty-third chapter, by him cited. And what remaineth, then, for Mr. Sutcliffe to lay hands on? Why doth he say, *but the chapter being read, doth confute our adversary's falsehood?* What falsehood is this, or wherein? And whereas Father Persons citeth two books of St. Bede and different chapters, why doth Mr. Sutcliffe cite but one book and one chapter only, dissembling and suppressing the other, that setteth down the whole story more largely, as if there were no such thing at all in Bede? Is this plain dealing? Is this sincere proceeding? Is not this falsity in matters of religion, which himself censured before for impiety?

Thirteenth objection.

28. There ensueth another charge in the 132nd page of his "Subversion," set down in these words: "Persons saith, that some hold that Joseph of Arimathea was sent into Britany by St. Peter, a matter of no moment, yet falsely affirmed by him, which careth not what he speaketh." So he. A heinous charge, no doubt; let us hear, then, what Father Persons, in his book of "Three Conversions," writeth hereof.* "Of Joseph (saith he) of Arimathea's coming into France, and his sending thence into Great Britany, either by St. Philip (as some say) who preached then in Gaul, or (as others hold) by St. Peter himself as he passed that way, to and from Britany, and how he obtained a place to exercise an eremitical life for him and his ten companions in the land called Avallonia, where Glastenbury after was builded: albeit I find no very certain or ancient writer to affirm it, yet because our later historiographers, for two hundred years past or more, do hold it to have come down by tradition (and, namely, Joannes Capgrave, a learned man of the order of St. Dominic, and others after him), I do not mean to dispute the matter here," &c.

29. Thus far he, who, as we see, affirmeth absolutely nothing thereof, but remitteth himself to the authority of the said Capgrave, Polidor Virgil, Cambden, Harpsfield, and others. And how then doth Mr. Sutcliffe say, that it

* Three Convers. p. 23; Jo. Capgrav. in Catal. SS. Brit.; Pol. Virgil, in Hist. Angl. l. 1; Cambd. in Descript. Brit. p. 152; Harpesf. in Hist. Eccl. fol. 3. [See Lingard's Ang. Sax. Ch. c. 1.]

is falsely affirmed by him that careth not what untruth he speaketh? or doth not this charge fall rather upon Mr. Sutcliffe himself, that so wrongfully layeth the same upon another? For if he say that Father Persons doth falsely affirm that divers later authors do hold it for a tradition, their own books will confute him, and especially all later English Protestant writers, besides the forenamed, as Holinshed, Fox, Stow, and the rest, who citeth also George Major; yea, the Magdeburgians, in their preface of the "Fourth Century," dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, do mention also the same. In this, then, there can be no controversy but that many and sundry authors do relate the same. And in the other, that Father Persons pretendeth not to take upon him to avouch this story, his own words will defend him. So as whatsoever Mr. Sutcliffe meaneth in this charge of Father Persons's false affirmation, must needs be convinced to be a mere slander and calumny.

30. After this again, page 134, he accuseth Father Persons of falsehood, for that speaking ^{fourteenth objection.} (saith he), page 147, of the Magdeburgians, he affirmeth that they accuse openly and by name *St. Athanasius, Basil, Nazianzen, Ambrose, Prudentius, Epiphanius, and Ephrem, for the error of praying to saints; but he that shall read the "Fourth Century" and fourth chapter thereof shall find the contrary.* So he writeth. And truly I could not but rest astonished, when I went to the place by him alleged, where I found all these foresaid fathers expressly reprehended by the Magdeburgians for praying to saints, in their paragraph *De Invocatione Sanctorum*—"Of Invocation of Saints;"* where setting down divers most plain sentences out of the said fathers for their praying to saints do reject the same, as *incommodas opiniones, stipulas, et errores*—"incommodious opinions, stubble, and errors." So as I cannot imagine how this answer of Mr. Sutcliffe can any way stand, that he that shall read this "Fourth Century" and fourth chapter shall find the contrary to that which Father Persons affirmed: whereas, indeed, he shall find the very selfsame ten times more

* Cent. 4, c. 4, p. 295.

largely avouched than he hath noted in his book. And to the end the reader may easily find the place, I do cite also the page and title of the paragraph, for that the chapter is long.

31. But now, besides this first shift in denying the thing that is most evidently extant in the book and place by him quoted, Mr. Sutcliffe* hath a second answer, or rather a subtle heap of evasions (as to me it seemeth), in these words: "The same is also proved (saith he) by reason; for what needed they to accuse the fathers, when neither their writings mentioned are certainly theirs, nor any matter is in these writings contained, that cannot probably be defended, and be wrested out of the hands of our adversaries, that by them would prove prayers to

Mr. Sutcliffe
teacheth the
Magdeburg-
gians to shift
off the fathers.

saints?" But this second answer seemed to me somewhat worse than the first, for that it importeth more guile and cunning in teaching the Magdeburgians to shift off the authorities of ancient fathers, either by denying their works, wherein notwithstanding they are bold and diligent enough of themselves, or to wrest their sentences by violent interpretations to their own purpose, wherein Mr. Sutcliffe would seem more cunning than they. And is not this a shameful matter, that points of religion, whereon men's salvation do depend, must thus be discussed by ingenious devices, subtle shifts, and evasions? Surely to me it seemeth a great indignity.

Fiftieth ob-
jection.

32. After this again, in the very next page, he accuseth Father Persons of another lie and false allegation about the British abbot Dinothus, that was slain at Chester with many of his monks. "He affirmeth (quoth Mr. Sutcliffe) that Dinothus was punished by the sword of Ethelfrid, after the death of St. Augustine: yet Bede, *lib. 2, Histor. cap. 3*, sheweth after this execution done upon the innocent Britons, how Augustine ordained two bishops, which he could not well do, being dead." This is the charge, somewhat obscurely set down, as you see; but all of purpose to dazzle the eyes of the reader,

* Subvers. p. 134.

and make him believe that Father Persons committed this absurdity, either to ascribe the making of two bishops to St. Augustine after he was dead, or to confess that the said Dinothus, Abbot of Bangor, was put to death with his monks at Chester, by Ethelfrid, King of Northumberland, while St. Augustine was alive, and by his incitation. Of which points both are manifestly false, and so expressly proved by the very history of St. Bede, alleged here by Mr. Sutcliffe, to the quite contrary, and consequently he must needs know that he wrote a notorious untruth. Father Persons's words are these :*

33. "As for Dinothus, Abbot of Bangor (saith he), he was the chiefest of those who opposed themselves against Augustine, and set other men against him also in Synodo Wiccionum, and was severely punished afterward for the same by the providence of God, as St. Bede noteth ; to wit, by the sword of Ethelfridus, a heathen king of Northumberland, long after the death of St. Augustine, when the said Dinothus and twelve hundred monks were slain at Chester by the soldiers of the said Ethelfrid, *Augustino jam multo ante tempore* (saith St. Bede) *ad caelestia regna sublato*†—

About the death of Dinothus and twelve hundred other monks.

'St. Augustine being taken to heaven long before ;' though Bale be not ashamed to say that it was done by his suggestion, praising the foresaid Dinothus and his confederates for that they would not preach baptism and celebrate Easter-day according to the custom of Rome and universal Catholic Church. So as now we see that these men care not what they say or avouch, so they say some-

* Three Convers. p. 204.

† Bede, lib. 2, Hist. c. 2. ["The authenticity of this passage has been denied by Godwin (De Præsul. Introd. c. 4), Parker (Antiq. Brit. p. 48), and a writer cited by Spelman (Concil. i. 110), and asserted by Alford (Annal. ii. 194—197), Cressy (Ch. Hist. 321), and Lingard (Antiq. Ang. Sax. Ch. 49, 50, note). As regards the charge against Austin, however, the question is of trifling importance. Wharton (Aug. Sac. i. 91) has proved beyond dispute that the saint died in 604 ; and the earliest date, that assigned by the Saxon Annals, for the massacre which he is accused of having procured, is 607. I ought to add that Collier has had the honesty to vindicate him from this unfounded calumny. Hist. i. 77, 78."—Mr. Tierney, in his New Ed. of Dodd's Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 28, note.]

what against Rome and those that any way favoured the same."

34. Hitherto are Father Persons's words, who citeth, as we see, the express words of St. Bede for his proof, that Augustine was gone to heaven long before this slaughter fell out of Dinotus and his monks of Bangor; and consequently could not be the inciter or persuader thereof, though at this time he prophesied and foretold the same, as Bede recounteth; for that he saw them so obstinately bent against the conversion of the English, as neither by his most earnest reasons, persuasions, nor by the sight of a manifest miracle, which in their presence he had wrought in confirmation of the truth of his doctrine, could he move them to join with him in that work of Englishmen's conversion, for which he foretold them, as Bede's words are,* *that if they would not preach the way of life to the English nation, they should by their hands receive the revenge of death*; which fell out afterward by the hands of King Ethelfrid, though long after the death of Augustine, as now hath been said. And then, within three lines after again, in the beginning of the third chapter, followeth in Bede the making of two bishops by St. Augustine; to wit, Mellitus and Justus; the one for London, the other for Rochester; which having declared, he setteth down the death of St. Augustine: *Defunctus est autem Deo dilectus pater Augustinus*—"Father Augustine, dearly beloved of God, departed out of this life," &c.

35. So as St. Bede, shewing that St. Augustine died after the making of the bishops, and long before the slaughter of Dinotus and his monks, what shall we say or think of this manner of proceeding of Mr. Sutcliffe? Is there any conscience or moral honesty in it at all? For, first, he accuseth Father Persons of a lie, for saying that Dinotus was slain by King Ethelfrid's soldiers *after* the death of Augustine, which yet St. Bede doth expressly affirm, as you have

Absurd denials
of Mr. Sut-
cliffe.

* Bede, lib. 2, Hist. cap. 2. ["Though we find St. Augustine in the next chapter consecrating two bishops, this is frequent with Bede to go backwards for the series of every distinct part of his history, or to work through a branch of it at once."—Mr. Giles' note, p. 356.]

heard, saying also that it was *multo tempore*, "a great while after;" secondly, he pretendeth to prove out of Bede, that St. Augustine ordained two bishops after the said slaughter of Dinotus and his monks, and consequently that either he was then alive or else ordained bishops after he was dead; but both of these points are apparently false, and refuted expressly by St. Bede, as you have heard in the very same place which himself allegeth to the contrary. Neither could he but see and know this, if he read the places; and consequently they must needs be, as I say, both witting and wilful falsities.

36. And now being exceeding weary in ^{Sixteenth ob-} wading thus far, I mean to stay myself, and to ^{jection.} end with adding only one thing more out of many that remain; and this is of a heinous charge, which Mr. Sutcliffe, page 135 of his pretended "Subversion," layeth upon Father Persons, of gross and impudent lying, for saying,* *that Archbishop Cranmer agreed to break King Henry VIII.'s last will, that he conspired to put down and destroy all the King's children, and was put to death for heresy and treason: Matters, certes* (saith he), *most grossly devised and impudently affirmed by this wicked heretic and traitor.* At which sharp assault I could not but marvel, even at the first sight, by that which I had heard and read of the proceedings of the council, whereof Bishop Cranmer was the chief in King Edward's days, when King Henry's line, to wit, his two daughters, were deprived of their succession by public proclamation, and Lady Jane Grey, of Suffolk, was actually made Queen; but yet, for better informing myself, I repaired unto Mr. Fox's "Acts and Monuments,"† where I found set down to this effect both the letter of Queen Mary, written from Kenninghall, of the 9th of July, 1552, as also the answer thereto of certain lords, whereof the first and chief was Thomas Canterbury, written to the said lady from the Tower of London, upon the said day and year; and in the former letter of the Lady Mary is set down the claim

* Examen of Fox's Calendar, c. 7, no. 29, in March. [Three Convers. ii. 373.]

† Fox's Acts and Monuments, p. 1279, col. 1.

of her right. "What hath been provided (saith she) by act of Parliament, and the testament and last will of our dear father, besides other circumstances advancing our right, you know, the realm and the whole world knoweth, the rolls and records appear by the authority of the King, our said father," &c.

37. And is not here a breaking of the King's last will and testament, objected by his own daughter? But let us hear somewhat of the other answer to this point. For answer thereof say they: "This is to advertise you that, forsomuch as our Sovereign Lady Queen Jane is after the death of our Sovereign Lord Edward VI. invested and possessed with the just right and title to the imperial crown of this realm, not only by good order of old ancient laws of this realm, but also by our late Sovereign Lord's letters-patent, &c., we must, therefore, as of most bounden duty and allegiance, assent unto her said Grace, and to none other, except we should (which faithful subjects cannot) fall into grievous and unspeakable enormities." So goeth that letter, and in the end hath this subscription: "Your ladyship's friends, shewing yourself an obedient subject, Thomas Canterbury," &c.

38. And this being so and extant in print, with what show of truth, trow you, doth Mr. Sutcliffe say, *that certes these are matters most grossly devised and impudently affirmed by Father Persons?* With whom here we shall end, assuring the reader that in all these heaps and accumulations of lies, falsifications, wilful corruptions, and the like, objected against him here or elsewhere by Mr. Sutcliffe, I find hitherto no one, to my knowledge, that may justly be condemned of any of these accusations. Errors sometimes, or missing in the citation of one chapter for another, or in orthography of words, as *seminit* for *seminat*, *Massilians* for *Messalians*, and such other trifles, which everywhere Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth, I confess sometimes to be found, which may be thought rather the error of the printer than of the author; forsomuch as I understand that these books are printed by strangers, and in places distant many hundred

Lord Cran-
mer's consent-
ing to the de-
priving of
King Henry's
line.

What I have
found in Fa-
ther Persons's
writings.

miles from the author himself. But as for any one thing that hitherto I have seen objected, that may be convinced of wilful falsehood, as known to be false by the author himself when he wrote it, which is the proper nature of wilful lying, and of which kind you have heard so many examples now alleged out of Mr. Sutcliffe, this, I say, I have not hitherto found. And by so much as I have read, I am induced to persuade myself, until I see the contrary proved, that it cannot be found, no, not one example.

39. Neither must Mr. Sutcliffe use here that sleight with me which he doth with another adversary of his, whom contemptuously he calleth Owlglass (though, as I hear, a very learned man), who objecting divers untruths against him, beginning only from the twentieth page of his book, he inferreth thereof, that all the former pages and the rest of his "Challenge" are free from all imputation of falsehood and untruth; and the same, perhaps, he will infer of me that forsomuch as I have examined some of his accusations and charges only, and have found them so faulty as hath been declared, that therefore all the rest are true, and clear from the same imputation. This, I say, should be a wrong inference, for that brevity of time and weariness of so loathsome a subject hath forced me to pretermitt and pass over many, and those that I have alleged I have taken commonly as they lay in his book, both in the beginning and ending, especially against Cardinal Bellarmine and Baronius, and against Father Persons also, in the precedent chapters concerning him, though in the last two, for that I divided his objections in two several ranks of impertinent and wilful calumniation, I was constrained also to change somewhat the order; but believe me, good reader, I find them all of one sort and quality; and should never have believed, if I had not found it myself, that there had been so false and unconscionable dealing in those that profess both truth and conscience.

A wrong inference by Mr. Sutcliffe for his own clearing.

CHAPTER IX.

What cogitations I had upon the sight and ponderation of all these falsities found in Mr. Sutcliffe's objections against Father Persons and others; and among other points, I thought whether it were possible for him to answer to these; and how for some trial hereof I resolved upon two different means here set down.

AND now, having travailed thus far in this enterprise of descrying true and false spirits, and laying before the eyes of my consideration the whole mass and multitude of deceitful and faithless dealings observed in so many Protestant writers, and especially in Mr. Sutcliffe above the rest, and calling to mind that I had found so many falsehoods and deceits in all sorts and manner of guile and fraud; as, namely, first, in false assertions and untrue asseverations, and then in guileful defences of those untruths when they were reprehended by their adversaries; and, thirdly, in objecting untruths to others, as before we saw by divers examples out of Mr. Jewell, and now again, by examination of like attempts out of Mr. Sutcliffe, the matter afflicted me exceedingly, and drove me into great perplexity of mind. For, as before I signified, to pass over wholly to the other side and change altogether my religion I had great aversion, in respect both of the temporal loss which I was thereby to undergo, as also of the public hatred of the name of Papists and Papistry impressed formerly in my heart, though now in judgment I was greatly shaken, suspecting and doubting that they had a far better cause than before I had persuaded myself, and that they were men of much more sincere proceeding in defending their cause than I found the writers of our side

to be. And yet for staying my mind somewhat, I began to think seriously with myself, whether any or the most part of those apparent untruths which it seemeth Mr. Sutcliffe, for example, hath been convinced of in these last four or five chapters, can by any way in substance of truth be answered or satisfied. And for trial of this I thought upon two means: the one, to make reflection upon divers principal untruths, which I seemed to myself to have discovered in this last examen, and that they were in my sight unanswerable; and the second means was, to see and consider what manner of satisfaction Mr. Sutcliffe had given heretofore in like untruths objected unto him by others, which might teach me what I might expect in these.

A question moved to myself for further satisfaction.

2. And as for the first, the more I thought of the matter, the more clear it seemed unto me that it was impossible for him to quit himself any thing handsomely in sundry particulars before laid unto his charge; albeit men say that he is a very cunning craftsman therein, and hath more shifts and wiles to escape than a man would imagine; but yet did I think with myself, how is it possible for him to avoid these, and these untruths before laid forth against him?

Two points of further trial.

3. As, for example, to begin with the very last mentioned and go backward, what will he say to that of Cranmer, touched in the end of the precedent chapter, where he denied *that the said Bishop Cranmer did agree to break King Henry's last will and testament, or conspired to have put down and disinherited his children?** which is proved not only out of John Fox's testimony, in his "Acts and Monuments," but also by Bishop Cranmer's own subscription of a common letter of the council, written to Queen Mary, as you have seen. That other also, where he denieth the same Bishop Cranmer to have concurred to the infaming of Queen Anne Bullen after her death, by pronouncing publicly and judicially that she was never King Henry's lawful wife; whereas, the same is convinced against him (to wit, that

Falsities that seem unanswerable.

* Sup. p. 455.

Bishop Cranmer so decreed and pronounced) by a public Act of Parliament, in print.*

4. That other, in like manner, which goeth a little before, where he chargeth Father Persons with a lie, for saying that the Abbot Dinotus was slain after the death of St. Augustine,† and affirmeth that Bede doth avouch that he was slain before; whereas Bede expressly saith, in the very same place by him cited, that Augustine was dead long before that slaughter. And immediately before that again he chargeth Father Persons with another lie, for that he saith the Magdeburgians accused openly and by name St. Athanasius, Basil, Nazianzen, Ambrose, Prudentius, Epiphanius, and Ephrem‡ for the error of prayer to saints, remitting his reader to see the contrary in the “Fourth Century” and fourth chapter; whereas in the very place all is set down and largely proved which Father Persons hath written thereof.

5. That other also, shewing his wit and will in cavilling, where, framing an accusation against his adversary, in that he said that Constantine, the emperor, entered into the empire next after Dioclesian, and founding all the force of his argument upon the word *next*,§ it is proved that he coined that word of himself, it not being found in Father Persons’s speech at all. And that other of like condition, where he saith the Greek authors, Eusebius and Epiphanius, are grossly belied by Father Persons, for that he allegeth them for proof of the word *mass*;|| whereas they are not alleged for that, but for the error of *Quartadecimani*, and St. Augustine and divers councils, wherein himself was, are alleged for the word *mass*, whose citation is notoriously abused and disordered by Mr. Sutcliffe to make his charge seem good. That other, in like manner, before this again, where he accuseth Father Persons of a lie,¶ for that he writeth that St. German, at his being in England, went to St. Alban’s sepulchre, and prayed there largely to the saint, &c., which Mr. Sutcliffe saith is not to be found in Bede in the place cited by Father Persons;

* Sup. p. 456.

§ Sup. p. 448.

† Sup. pp. 453, 454.

|| Sup. pp. 441, 442.

‡ Sup. p. 451.

¶ Sup. p. 424.

but I found it there, and the whole matter largely set down, and so may any man that will read over the said chapter.

6. These few may be considered, among many other out of the precedent chapters, which I cannot see nor imagine with what art or device they may be avoided or freed from the conviction of manifest, clear, and self-willed untruths, and so known by him that uttered the same, which containeth the true definition of formal lies, as before hath often been mentioned; and yet, if we will pass further upward to the chapters, we may find other examples not inferior to these. As that where he layeth to Father Persons's charge,* that he falsely affirmeth Pope Sixtus Quartus to have left it free for every one to think what he would about the conception of our Blessed Lady in original sin: and this, I say, Mr. Sutcliffe objecteth here again for a lie; having seen Father Persons, in his "Warn-word," to have brought forth the very words of Pope Sixtus, in two several constitutions, testifying the same, that he left it free: this, then, I would fain know, how it can be answered or shifted off. As also that other before the same, to wit, that the whole world knoweth it to be a lie (as Mr. Sutcliffe saith †) that Socrates was put to death for scoffing and contemning the Athenian gods, and that Plato and all others that write of Socrates's death do testify the same; whereas the contrary is expressly shewed out of both his and other writings, as before you have heard.

7. In like sort, that other speech of St. Chrysostom and St. Gregory, about angels being present at the sacrifice, ‡ it being objected as a lie by Mr. Sutcliffe, saying, *that not one holy father can be brought for the same*, when as he must needs have seen before the words of two holy fathers set down at large most evidently testifying it; this, I say, I would know, by what figure of speech it may be excused from a wilful lie. § As also that other concerning the law of Justinian, the emperor, beginning *Reddentes*, || &c., wherein Mr. Sutcliffe avoucheth *that there is no one*

* Sup. p. 397.

† Sup. p. 366.

‡ Sup. p. 358.

§ Sup. p. 396.

|| Sup. p. 400.

word to be found that importeth subjection, either of the emperor or empire, to the Church of Rome; which yet is confuted by so many evident words and clauses of the said law itself, as I know not possibly how it may be excused from a wilful untruth. As neither that other, wherein he chargeth Father Persons with a fourfold lie, for saying that St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Gregory, and St. Bernard did persuade men by their examples to be afraid of *purgatory*, for that none of them (saith he) did either speak of *purgare*, or believed any such *purgatory*, &c., whereas, notwithstanding, their plain evident words are laid forth to the contrary for every man to read. What then may be said or thought of this?

A dozen lies of
Mr. Sutcliffe
taken out of
more than a
hundred.

8. These dozen then of so notorious untruths, taken out of more, perhaps, than a hundred, no less false than these, though not perhaps so apparently, and all committed in objecting untruths to others, seemed to me to be altogether unanswerable; yet, for that I had understood that Mr. Sutcliffe had pretended to answer other such like charges laid against him before, no less clear than these, as some have told me, I procured to have a sight thereof to judge thereby what his ability and custom is in such like straits. And, first, I procured the sight of a certain treatise, entitled "A Relation of the Trial made before the King of France upon the year 1600, between the Bishop of Eureux and the Lord Plessis Mornay, about certain points of corrupting and falsifying Authors, whereof the said Plessis was openly convicted: with a Defence thereof both against the Lord Plessis in France, and O. E. (otherwise Matthew Sutcliffe) in England." This was the title.

9. This treatise came forth the year 1604, and was written, as Mr. Sutcliffe avoucheth, by Father Persons; but whosoever was author thereof, he seemeth to prove the point in controversy very substantially, to wit, that Monsieur Plessis was convicted openly and most manifestly in the hearing of the said King and his council, and great

* See the third part of the Three Conversions, containing the Examen of the first six months [of Fox's Calendar. The 'Relation' is at the end of the volume.]

number of the nobility of France, in nine several places that day examined, out of threescore laid before him to choose, as appeareth both by the public acts set forth in French, by authority and approbation of the said King that was present, and by the particulars themselves of the conference set down what was said and replied about every place. And for that Mr. Sutcliffe, seeing this man convicted by so many witnesses, thought good to offer himself to his supply, and to overthrow that condemnation of false dealing laid upon Monsieur Plessis by the French judges of both sides, both Catholics and Protestants, I thought it not amiss to consider what he performed in this affair, though very briefly, remitting the reader to the said treatise itself of "Relation," where things are handled more particularly. For if Mr. Sutcliffe have answered sufficiently for another, it is like he will do better for himself.

The conference
between the
Bishop of Gu-
reux and Lord
Plessis Mor-
nay.

Untruths objected to Monsieur Plessis Mornay; and how they are defended by Master Sutcliffe.

SECTION 1.

NINE places* then I find to have been examined in that first day of conference out of eight hundred that were first objected to have been committed in one treatise against the mass, and, out of those, four hundred selected as most principal, and out of them again threescore offered up to Monsieur Plessis's election, whereof he chose nineteen, and time permitted only nine to be handled; in all which nine the judges of both parts† did give sentence that Monsieur Plessis had falsified the same. The first was, that he alleged the authority of Scotus, as doubting of the *real presence*, for that, after the manner of schoolmen, proposing the question, whether Christ's body were really in the sacrament or no, he be-
ginneth first to argue for the contrary part, saying: ‡ *Vide-*

About the real
presence.

* Defence of the Relation, p. 81.

† [There were three Catholics: the president Du Thou, M. Pitheu, and M. Le Fevre. And an equal number of Protestants: the president Calignon, Casaubon, and De Fresne Canaye.]

‡ Scot. in 4 Sent. Dist. 10, Quæst. 1.

tur quod non—"it seemeth that it is not;" and so setting down the objections or arguments for the contrary part, solveth them as false, and maketh his determination for the affirmative, saying: *Dico, quòd corpus Christi esse ibi verè, realiter est simpliciter de substantia fidei*—"I say that it is simply a substantial article of our faith to believe that Christ's body is truly and really there in the sacrament." Upon which matter being discussed, the sentence was given in these words, in French: * *Que le Sieur de Plessis avoit pris l'objection pour la resolution*—"That the Lord Plessis had taken the objection for the resolution."

11. The second place was out of Durand to the very like effect, where, objecting arguments against *transub-*

* French Acts, fol. 34. [This celebrated French Calvinist is not the only one who has misrepresented Scotus; and as copies of the work of that old schoolman just referred to are at the present day not generally accessible, it will not be amiss to state more at length how he handles the subject of the real presence. As Walsingham has observed, Scotus follows the custom of the schoolmen, by alleging the arguments for the contrary, to which he, according to the same custom, opposes his *SED CONTRA*. Then begins the resolution, which is as follows: *Dico quod corpus Christi esse ibi vere realiter (est) simpliciter de substantia fidei eo modo quo veritas alicujus sacramenti pertinet ad articulos fidei. Ista enim veritas a principio fuit expresse tradita ex quo eucharistia fuit instituta.* He cites the words of Institution as the "ground" of this doctrine, and in continuation observes, that should "HERETICS" contend for a figurative interpretation, and allege such texts as John xv. "I am the vine;"—1 Cor. x. "The rock was Christ;"—it may be satisfactorily answered, that where our Lord's discourse is figurative, the language is shewn to be figurative, either by the context itself or by another passage: as in the former of these texts the apostles are declared to be "branches" of the vine, so that the figurative import of the declaration, "I am the vine," is manifest. But on this matter, observes Scotus, both context and other scripture establish the reality.—The context: for to the words, "This is my body," is subjoined, "which shall be delivered for you;" to the words, "This is my blood," is subjoined, "which shall be shed for you." And, besides, there is a manifest proof of the same in the sixth chapter of St. John, ubi est diffusa prædicatio de isto sacramento. (Scotus, ubi supra, fol. 35. Venice ed. 1515.) Let us now hear Dr. Turton, the present Dean of Westminster. (The R. C. Doctrine of the Eucharist considered, p. 290.) "Duns Scotus—the great *doctor subtilis* of the fourteenth century—COULD NOT DISCOVER...that the real presence in the eucharist may be deduced from Scripture...The schoolman, indeed, had really studied the subject." Now, having seen Duns Scotus declare that the real presence was taught by our Lord himself in his discourse recorded in John vi. and at the institution of the sacrament, the reader can come to no other conclusion than that this doctor of the nineteenth century has not "really studied" Duns Scotus.]

stantiation, which afterward he solveth,* M. Plessis inferred thereof that Durand was of his opinion; though Durand, within few lines after, affirmed expressly the contrary, and consequently the same sentence was given upon this place, *That the Lord Plessis had taken the objection for the resolution*; which either must be extreme ignorance or wilful malice.†

12. The third place was out of St. Chrysostom, whom Monsieur Plessis affirmed, that upon these words of Jeremiah the Prophet, *If Moses and Samuel stood before me, my affection should not be unto this people, &c.*,‡ he did teach, that we must not rest ourselves upon the prayer of saints; but must work our salvation, as St. Peter saith, *in fear and trembling*; but St. Chrysostom's works being brought forth, in Latin and Greek, of divers editions, it was found that his words were, § “We must neither neglect the prayers of saints for us, nor yet put ALL our hope therein, for that the one will deprive us of great succour, the other will make us idle and negligent. Wherefore we must pray to them to make intercession and hold up their hands for us, and we, of our part, must live virtuously.” Out of which words, Monsieur Plessis was convinced of divers wilful falsifications: first, that he left out the word *all*, when he saith, *we must not put ALL our hope in the prayers of saints*; secondly, that he maketh St. Chrysostom to deny the praying to saints, which he doth not only expressly teach, but also exhort men to the same.¶ So as here also sentence

* Durand in iv. Sentent. Dist. 11.

† French Acts, fol. 46; Relat. 85, 89.

‡ Jerem. xv.

§ Chrysost. Hom. 1, in 2 Thess. [Ταῦτα τοίνυν εἰδότες, μήτε καταφρονῶμεν τῶν εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων, μήτε το ΠΑΝ ἀνταῖς ἐπιφύπτωμεν τοῦτο μὲν ἵνα μὴ ῥαθυμῶμεν καὶ εἰκὴ ζῶμεν, ἐκείνο δὲ ἵνα μὴ ΠΟΛΛΟὺ ΚΕΡΔΟΥΣ ἐκπίσωμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρακαλῶμεν ἐνχεσθαι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ χεῖρας ὀρέγειν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐχώμεθα τῆς ἀρετῆς.]

¶ French Acts, fol. 52. [This is evident from the passage just cited. But that the unfair dealing complained of may be made more evident, here is another passage from the very same homily. St. Chrysostom proposes the common objection: “What need of others’ prayers?” and answers it from Scripture. Καὶ τίς χρεῖα, φησί, τῆς παρ’ ἑτέρου εὐχῆς, ὅταν ἐγὼ εὐαρεσῶ; μὴδέποτε τοῦτο εἴπῃς ἀνθρώπε· χρεῖα καὶ πολλῆς χρεῖα εὐχῆς.]

was given by the chancellor, in all the judges' names, against him, *That he had left out that which he should have put in.*

About the same. 13. The fourth place was out of the same Chrysostom, about the same argument of praying to saints, though in another place of his works, where he maketh the said doctor to seem to dissuade men from praying to saints, for that he exhorteth every man earnestly to labour for himself; * but he suppresseth craftily the words of St. Chrysostom ensuing, that explain his meaning, which are these: *And this we say* (quoth he) *not to the end we should not make our prayers and supplications unto saints, but that we should not thereby become slothful in doing also for ourselves.*† Out of which words, not only M. Plessis was convinced of falsehood, for suppressing them, but also for making St. Chrysostom to say quite contrary to himself. And this also was noted, by St. Chrysostom's much admonishing men not to trust altogether in the intercession of saints, that there must needs be great opinion and practice of that doctrine among the people in those days that forced St. Chrysostom so often to exhort them not to put their whole confidence therein, and thereby neglect to do any thing on their own parts. And so, after examination of many books and editions, the like sentence was given as upon the former place.

About trusting in saints. 14. The very like corruption, in the fifth place, was objected and proved out of St. Jerome ‡ against Monsieur Plessis concerning the same subject of praying to saints, of whom Monsieur Plessis's words are these: § “ St. Jerome, in his ‘Commentaries,’ when he was out of choler and grief, did write thus: ‘Albeit

ἀκούει γὰρ τῶν Θεῶν λέγοντος περὶ τῶν φίλων τοῦ Ἰωβ, κ. τ. λ. It is customary with Catholic writers at the present day to allege this same instance in proof of the efficacy of the intercession of saints (Lingard's Tracts, p. 86), and equally so to regulate the confidence which they seek to inspire in their intercession by insisting on that which St. Chrysostom requires in the foregoing passage. (See Challoner's Medit. Sept. 8th.)]

* Chrysost. Hom. 5, in Matth.

† [Καὶ ταῦτα λέγω, ὅχι ἵνα μὴ κενεώωμεν τοὺς ἁγίους, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ραθυμώωμεν.]

‡ Hier. in Ezech. lib. 4, c. 14.

§ French Acts, fol. 97.

they be saints, albeit they be prophets, yet must we not confide in them, nor yet in the prince of the church; though they be just, yet shall they deliver but their own souls, and not those of their children.’” But he was convinced to have craftily left out the clause that most imported for explication of St. Jerome’s meaning, *si fuerint negligentes*, “if their children be negligent, then cannot saints save them,” as St. Chrysostom said before, which St. Jerome repeateth again, in other words, saying: *Nec principes nos potuerunt liberare, nisi filiorum fuerit assensus, et illorum obsecrationes suis conatibus iuverint*—“That the chief and principal saints of the church cannot deliver us, except we, their children, do give our consents thereunto, and except we do aid their prayers made for us by our own good endeavours.” So as these clauses, being guilefully left out, which do plainly set forth the true meaning of St. Jerome, he was convicted again of fraud, and sentence given by the judges, *que le passage avoit deu estre mis entier*—“that this place or passage of St. Jerome ought to have been set down entire.”

15. The sixth place of falsification was out of St. Cyril, about the honouring of the cross, About honouring the cross. which Monsieur Plessis objected in his book against the mass, in these words: (*Page 89*) *Cyril* (saith he) *reproached by Julian, the emperor, for honour done unto the cross, answered flatly that the Christians did neither adore nor honour the sign of the cross.* But his adversary, Bishop Perron, convinced him that his whole answer was feigned by him, and not to be found in Cyril;* and, after much dispute and sundry evasions sought and attempted by Monsieur Plessis, sentence was given by the judges, in these words: *That the passage alleged by Monsieur Plessis was not found in Cyril.*

16. The seventh place examined was out of the “Code of Imperial Laws,” about painting or carving the sign of the cross: out of which About painting or carving the cross upon the ground.

* French Acts, fol. 76. [St. Cyril says: παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἀπάσης ἀρετῆς εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ τοῦ τιμίου σταυροῦ ποιούμεθα ξύλον: in answer to Julian’s scoff at the “worship” of the cross, signing it on the forehead, the painting of the representation of it on houses.]

law Monsieur Plessis cited a decree of the Emperors Theodosius and Valens,* in these words: *Forsomuch* (say they) *as we have care of nothing more than of the service of God, we forbid all sorts of persons to make the sign of our Saviour Jesus Christ, either in colours, stone, or other matter, &c.* Which text was proved by the Bishop Perron to have been falsely alleged, for that the true words of the Code are these: *Cum sit nobis cura diligens,† &c.*—"Whereas

* [Not *Valens*, but *Valentinian*. Walsingham is not the only writer who has made this mistake, as the reader will see presently.]

† Cod. l. 1, tit. 3, *Nemini licere, &c.* [Anno 427.—Imp. Theod. and Valentin. A. A. Eudoxio P. P.—*Cum sit nobis cura diligens per omnia super ni Numinis religionem tueri: signum Salvatoris Christi nemini licere vel in SOLO, vel in silice, vel in marmoribus HUMI POSITIS insculpere vel pingere: sed quodcumque reperitur tolli: gravissimā poenā multando eo qui contrarium statutis nostris tentaverit: specialiter imperamus.*—(Corp. J. Civ. fol. 36. Amst. 1663.) The object of the law is so plainly declared in the title, "*Nemini licere...humi,*" &c., and its language is so clear and precise, that misconstruction was impossible: resort was, therefore, had to the expedient of falsifying it by suppressing the important words "*ON THE FLOOR,*" "*LYING ON THE GROUND,*" words which shew the piece to be wholly inapplicable to controversial purposes. Those who endeavour to serve the interests of their party by keeping up and accrediting the imposture are, of course, accomplices with the original contriver, and must take their share in the infamy attendant on such perversion of testimony. Who was the original contriver of this fraud, it is needless to inquire: this may be safely said, that Du Plessis was not. For, almost forty years before the Conference held between him and Du Perron, the same untruth had been boldly advanced in terms which deserve the especial attention of the reader. "But from learning by painted stories, it came by little and little to IDOLATRY; which, when godly men (as well emperors and learned bishops as others) perceived, they commanded that such pictures, images, and idols should be used no more. And I will, for a declaration thereof, begin with the decree of the ancient Christian emperors, Valens and Theodosius II., who reigned about four hundred years after our Saviour Christ's ascension, who forbad that *any* images should be made or painted *privately*: for certain it is that there was *none* in temples *publicly* in their times." [This last assertion is equally untrue with that which precedes it; for at the time when this law was issued, St. Augustine was Bishop of Hippo, and his friend Paulinus was Bishop of Nola, in Italy. Now the former distinctly specifies the subject of some pictures in the church where he preached, and the latter describes in the church of St. Felix the pictures of all the histories of the Pentateuch, of Tobit, Judith, &c.—The writer continues:] "These emperors did write unto the captain of the army attending on the emperors after this sort: 'Valens and Theodosius, emperors, unto the captain of the army: Whereas, we have a diligent care to maintain the religion of God above in all things, we will grant to no man to set forth, grave, carve, or paint the image of our Saviour Christ in colours, stone, or any other matter; but in what *place* soever it shall be found, we command that it be taken away, and that all such as shall attempt any thing contrary

our care is diligent in all things to defend the religion of Almighty God, we command that it shall not be lawful for any man to carve or paint the sign of our Saviour Christ, either on the ground, or in any stone or marble lying upon the ground, &c.;" which ordination the bishop did shew to have been made by the emperors for more honour of the sacred images of our Saviour, to the end that they should not be defiled with men's feet, as appeareth by the same prohibition, made and confirmed not long after by the Council of Constantinople, named in Trullo,* where it is said: *We command that all the figures of the cross that are made upon pavements be taken away or defaced, to the end that the triumphant sign of our victory be not defiled by men's feet:* which being heard, and seeing that Plessis had fraudulently left out the words *humi* and *in solo*—"on the ground," and "lying upon the ground," sentence was also given against him.

17. The eighth and ninth places examined were out of St. Bernard and Theodoret, both of them fraudulently alleged with cutting off and leaving out, as in the former hath been seen; and, for brevity's sake, I remit the reader

to our decree or commandment herein shall be most sharply punished.' This decree is written in the book named *Libri Augustales*, &c. &c."—The resemblance between this false representation and that furnished by Du Plessis is so close, that the latter may be presumed to be a mere transcript of the former. At all events, the fraud is traced back to a book, which the Church of England, in the thirty-fifth of her thirty-nine articles, declares to "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times." (*Homilies*, &c. On the Peril of Idolatry, p. 178. Oxford, 1840.) The perversion of history which has been here exposed, is by no means the most flagrant of those with which that book abounds. Nor will this fact occasion much surprise to those who have attentively read sundry foregoing chapters of Walsingham, and have formed a just estimate of the insincerity of the author of the greater part of the *Homilies*—Bishop JEWELL.]

* Concil. Constant. in Trullo, can. 73. [Anno 692. Νῶ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ αἰσθήσει τὴν προσκύνησιν αὐτῷ ἀπονέμοντες, τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ τύπους ὑπὸ τινῶν κατασκευαζομένους ἐξαφανίζεσθαι παντοίως προστάσσομεν ὥς ἂν μὴ τῶν βαδιζομένων καταπατήσῃ τὸ τῆς νικῆς ἡμῶν τρόποιον ἐνυβρίζοντο. The reader will observe the veneration in which the council professes to hold the cross: a veneration which was the motive of its enactment. On the same principle, St. Bernard, in the twelfth century, severely reproveth, as *irreverent*, the painting or inlaying of figures of saints and angels on the pavement of churches. (Apol. ad Gulielm. c. 12, Tom. i. 1243.) Ut quid saltem sanctorum imagines non reveremur, quibus utique ipsum, quod pedibus conculcatur, scatet pavementum? &c.]

to the said "Treatise" of Father Persons, where the particulars are discussed, and much more in the French Acts themselves, fol. 83 and 105, for that my purpose is here only to mention the same with all brevity; as also to consider with like brevity what Mr. Sutcliffe can say in effect to these manifest convictions, thereby to judge of his talent therein, as before hath been signified.

Mr. Sutcliffe's Answer and Defence of the former Untruths objected.

SECTION 2.

To the first place then of Scotus he saith, *that Monsieur Plessis could not be charged with falsification, seeing he doth not quote the words of Scotus, but setteth down his own collection: so as the most that could be said was, that he had mistaken the meaning of Scotus.** This is his first answer, which seemeth to me very poor, that so learned a man as Monsieur Plessis should mistake the meaning of Scotus, to wit, the objection for the solution in so plain a matter. His second answer to the same is, that Scotus did indeed call into question, *Whether Christ's body be really in the sacrament by transubstantiation or no?* which word of *transubstantiation*, you must know that it is put in by Mr. Sutcliffe, thereby to seek an evasion; for that Scotus doth simply propose this question, *Whether Christ be really present by any way at all in the sacrament*, either by *transubstantiation*, or otherwise; so as this seemeth a shift only to draw the matter from the question of *real presence* to *transubstantiation*, which are two different things and questions; and yet is he convinced in them both,† as you may see in the said "Treatise," cap. 5.

* Sutcliffe, in his Refut. p. 12.

† [i. e. Sutcliffe is confuted in both particulars. As to the latter, Sutcliffe says, "Nay, Scotus seemeth rather to dislike transubstantiation than otherwise." Of this the reader shall judge. Scotus begins by alleging arguments against that mode of Christ's presence: we have seen him do the same against the *reality* itself. Before proceeding to answer these objections in particular, he asserts the doctrine of transubstantiation as attested by St. Am-

19. To the second place of Durand, where Monsieur Plessis took also the objection for the resolution about the point of *transubstantiation*, Mr. Sutcliffe saith, in effect, nothing at all, nor so much as mentioneth it (saith the "Treatise"), but addeth two notorious untruths of his own, upon other pretended words of Durand, saying, first, that it may plainly be gathered by Durand's words, that the determination only of the Council of Lateran and the Romish Church moved him to hold *transubstantiation*, whereof (saith the "Treatise") there is no such word in Durand, but the plain contrary; forsomuch as he proveth *transubstantiation*, not only by the Council of Lateran, but also by divers clear sentences of ancient fathers; namely, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Prosper, and Eusebius, which lived long before the Council of Lateran. His second untruth is where he saith, not only the Protestants but Bellarmine also doth note the same in Durand, taxing him for hard belief of *transubstantiation*, which is convinced to be false by the words of Bellarmine, in the self-same place which Mr. Sutcliffe allegeth, where Bellarmine* expressly affirmeth Durand to hold the bread to be converted by the words of consecration into the true body

To the second place.

Two untruths in Mr. Sutcliffe.

brose and other fathers, as avouched in church decisions, and in accordance with the Church liturgy, &c. Of his answer to objections the following passage is the most important: *Dicendum quod ecclesia declaravit istum intellectum esse de veritate fidei in illo symbolo edito sub Innocentio III. in Concilio Lateranensi: Firmiter credimus, &c. ... ubi explicite ponitur veritas aliquorum credendorum magis explicite quam habebatur in symbolo Apostolorum, vel Athanasii, vel Nicæni. Et breviter quidquid ibi dicitur esse credendum tenendum est esse de substantiâ fidei. Et hoc post istam declarationem solemnem factam ab ecclesiâ. Et si queramus quare voluit ecclesia eligere istum intellectum ita difficilem hujus articuli, cum verba scripturæ possent salvari secundum intellectum faciliorem et veriolem secundum apparentiam: De hoc articulo dico quod eo spiritu expositæ sunt scripturæ quo conditæ. Et ita supponendum est, quod Ecclesia Catholica eo spiritu exposuit, quo tradita est nobis fides; Spiritu scilicet veritatis edocta. Et ideo hunc intellectum elegit, quia verus est. Non enim in potestate ecclesiæ fuit facere istud verum vel non verum; sed Dei instituentis: sed intellectum a Deo traditum ecclesia explicavit, directa in hoc, ut creditur, Spiritu veritatis (f. 47). Scotus resolves the belief of this "divinely delivered" dogma into the belief of the divine authority of the church proposing it. Just as St. Augustine did with respect to the GOSPEL itself: Ego vero Evangelio non crederem nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas.—Contra Ep. Fundam.]*

* Bellar. l. 3, De Eucharist. c. 11.

of Christ our Saviour, though he hold also a certain particular opinion about the manner thereof, which is nothing to the main controversy. So as here Mr. Sutcliffe, saying nothing in succour of his client, is convinced to have uttered two new gross untruths of his own.

20. And the like falleth out in the third place taken out of St. Chrysostom about prayer to saints, where Monsieur Plessis, corruptly alleging a place out of that father, that *we must not pray to saints at all*, the true text is proved to say, *that we must pray to saints, and not deprive ourselves of so great a succour*;* which Mr. Sutcliffe goeth about to answer by saying, first, that Monsieur Plessis doth not allege Chrysostom's own words, but maketh a collection upon them; and, secondly, that the said collection may evidently be gathered out of St. Chrysostom's words; both which points are returned upon him as manifest untruths by Father Persons in that place: first, for that St. Chrysostom's own words were alleged and corrupted by Plessis, leaving out the clauses that expressly made against him, as before hath been seen; and, secondly, his whole meaning was perverted, for that the said father intending to exhort men to pray to saints, but yet so as that they should not thereby be negligent of their own parts to live well, Monsieur Plessis made him speak as though he dehorted men from praying to saints at all; whereby appeareth also that these two points of supply alleged by Mr. Sutcliffe are in like manner most evidently false. So as for excusing one lie of his friend, he is convicted himself of two, which is evil luck indeed, or at least a very evil negotiation.

Desperate way
of answering
old lies with
new. 21. And the like happeneth unto him in all the other places, where he, going about to defend one falsehood, multiplieth many himself; as, namely, in the sixth place, he is convinced of three together, and amongst other to deceive his reader in the controversy of honouring the cross of Christ, he allegeth the saying of Minutius Felix, a pagan writer,† *Cruces nec*

* [See the passage quoted, p. 465.]

† [A *convert* from paganism, at the commencement of the third century. See Alban Butler, June 3.]

adoramus nec optamus—"We neither worship nor desire crosses;" whereas the other's meaning is, that we neither worship nor desire gibbets or gallows. And this did Mr. Sutcliffe allege and bring in again to deceive his reader withal, after he had seen the same confuted once or twice before. And by this we see somewhat his talent in answering and avoiding lies objected unto him, to wit, by multiplication and addition of lies to lies, making many for the avoiding of one, as the reader may further see by the perusal of the forenamed "Treatise." These only I have noted for a taste, not thinking it necessary to prosecute the whole, which may be seen in that book, which is extant.

How Mr. Sutcliffe answereth Lies objected against Himself.

SECTION 3.

IN the former paragraph we have shewed, by some examples, how Mr. Sutcliffe hath answered lies and falsehoods objected against his friend: now shall we briefly see some examples, how he hath answered untruths objected against himself. And, first, in his book entitled "The Defence of his Challenge," he pretendeth to answer twenty-six untruths objected against him out of one chapter only, and the very first of his said "Challenge," by E. O., *alias* (as he interpreteth) Mr. Woodward, a learned man, as I am informed, whom, notwithstanding, by contempt, he always called Owlglass. And the very first of the said twenty-six charges is founded upon these words of Mr. Sutcliffe's "Challenge:"* *In the sacrament of baptism (saith he) the Papists use exorcisms, blowings, salt, spittle, hallowed water, anointings, lights, and divers ceremonies not used by the apostles, nor practised by the ancient church.* Against which asseveration Mr. Woodward, taking hold, sheweth by divers evident and forcible proofs, as may appear by Mr. Sutcliffe's "Answer" (for the book itself of Mr. Woodward I have not seen), that the use of these ceremonies was in practice in the ancient church,

* Sutcliffe, in his First Challenge, c. 1, n. 10.

and this he proveth not only by the testimonies of Origen, Nazianzen, Ambrose, and Petrus Chrysologus, but also by the confession of Mr. Calvin himself, who granteth* that he knoweth *the ceremonies of exsufflation, hallowing of water, anointing, and lights, to be ancient*; but much more indeed he might have alleged out of the Magdeburgians themselves, who, in their "Fourth Century" and sixth chapter, do allege many ancient fathers testifying the use of these and other ceremonies in their days. Now let us see how Mr. Sutcliffe doth quit himself of all this.

Mr. Sutcliffe's
defence against
Mr. Blood-
ward.

23. First he beginneth with John Calvin, as him whom it seemeth he held in chiefest respect, saying: *What if it be true* (that Calvin doth confess it), and *what if Mr. Calvin do not confess that which I say to be untruth?* And then, further: *neither doth Calvin nor any of these fathers mention either the use of the apostles or practice of the ancient church; nor doth any father speak of all these ceremonies together.* Where

Great variety
of sleights and
shifts.

I note three sleights:—First, that he would avoid the authorities of the fathers cited, for that they do not name the use of the apostles; whereas his negative proposition being general, *that neither the apostles nor the ancient church had use thereof*, it is sufficient that his adversary prove any one part of the said negative; to wit, *that they were in use in the ancient church.* Secondly, he bindeth these ancient fathers to speak of the ancient church before them, whereas it is sufficient they speak of the church of their own time, being within the first four or five hundred years after Christ, and consequently their church may be also called ancient. Thirdly, he will have them speak of all these ceremonies together, or else it is nothing to the purpose. And then he goeth further, saying, that albeit he should grant that those ceremonies were all used in time of the fathers' church, yet were they not used in the form that the Romanists now use them. And so, with this and other sleights and jests, he shifteth off the whole matter, seeking occasion to jest and scoff at the fathers produced: as for that St. Ambrose saith, *that the priest used to touch*

* Calv. lib. 4, Institut. c. 15, sect. 19.

the ears and nostrils of those that were baptized.* Owl-glass (saith he) will infer, that whosoever doth touch his nose, doth spit in his face also, and such other like scoffs.

24. But when I weighed indifferently the antiquity and grave authority of these fathers, and in what flourishing times of the church they lived, and went again to the Magdeburgians to consider better what they allege out of the same authors, as out of *St. Basil*,† *Primum post baptismi ablutionem, olei inunctio*—"First after the washing of baptism is the anointing with oil." And the same they shew out of *St. Ambrose*,‡ *Chrisma inungens, &c.*—"When the priest did anoint with chrisem, he said: 'Almighty God, which hath regenerated thee by water, and the Holy Ghost, he anoint thee unto life everlasting.'" *Chrisma etiam in ampulla conservari solitum indicat Optat. Milevit.*§ (say the Magdeburgians)—"Optatus Milevitanus doth shew that holy chrisem was wont in his time to be conserved in a little cruet." Then out of *St. Nazianzen*,|| who in a particular oration, entitled, *In Sanctum Lavacrum: Hos ritus baptismum consecutos, recitat et explicat*, say the Magdeburgians—"He doth recite and explicate these rites which do follow baptism." *Ante magnum altare constitueris, &c., lampades accendis, &c.*—"Thou art placed before the great or high altar; thou dost light the lamps;" *venturæ illuminationis mysterium*—"which is a mystery, or secret signification of the illumination that is to come unto thee," saith Nazianzen. Other ceremonies also they recite out of ancient fathers of that time and before, which are not admitted or used by the Protestants at this day; as that of *St. Jerome*:¶ *Multa sunt quæ per traditionem in ecclesia observantur, velut in lavacro ter caput mergitare*—"Many things (saith he) are observed in the church by tradition, as to dip the head three times in baptism;" whereof he sheweth the reason in another place, saying: *Ter mergitur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat sacramentum*—

* Ambrose, De Sacram. lib. 1, c. 1.

† Basil, l. 1, De Spiritu Sancto, c. 28.

‡ Ambros. l. De iis qui initiantur, c. 7 et 8.

§ Optat. l. 5, contra Parmenian. || Nazian. in Orat. 3, in sanctum Lavacr.

¶ Hieron. advers. Lucif. et in c. 4 ad Ephes.

"We are three times dipped in the water, that the sacrament of the Trinity may appear one." And then, again, that of St. Ambrose,* whereat Mr. Sutcliffe before jested: *Tangi os, aures, et nares baptizandis à sacerdote*—"That the priest must touch the mouth, ears, and nostrils of them that are to be baptized."

25. All these things, I say, being laid together; and considering, further, that every testimony of these ancient fathers for the use of any of these ceremonies about baptism in their days inferred the plain contradictory to Mr. Sutcliffe's former asseveration, *that they were not practised by the ancient church*, and consequently that they inferred so many untruths against Mr. Sutcliffe as there are several testimonies for several ceremonies; and that his shifts either of jesting at the fathers, or of saying, *that no one father speaketh of all these ceremonies together, nor that they were generally received in all the churches; or if so, yet were they not used in the form which the Romans now use them*. And, albeit that Mr. Calvin knew how ancient some of those ceremonies are, yet doth he not express how ancient they are, nor speaketh he any thing of their several forms, according as the ritual books, now in practice in the Roman Church, do prescribe.

A consideration about Mr. Sutcliffe.

26. All these shifts and evasions, I say, did make me see that Mr. Sutcliffe could not answer any thing in real substance of truth, and that it was but lost labour to demonstrate never so many or manifest untruths or lies against him, for that still he would clear himself by only saying, that he had the victory, as in this place he doth. For having answered, in the manner which you have heard, this first charge of Mr. Woodward laid against him, he concludeth, notwithstanding, in these triumphant words: *I have therefore sufficiently discharged myself* (quoth he) *of the accusation he would fasten upon me*. But how he hath discharged himself you have now seen and heard; and for that in all the other twenty-five charges that do ensue he useth the very same discharge, by jests, scoffs, and shifts; this first example shall be sufficient for a taste and token of

* Amb. 1. De his qui initiantur, c. 4.

his talent in answering; remitting the reader to that which Mr. Woodward himself hath further replied, and Father Persons also, in the foresaid relation of Monsieur Plessis's trial, and sixth chapter, where there be so many convictions laid forth against Mr. Sutcliffe for wilful untruths, falsities, and falsifications, within the compass of a few leaves, and those, as it seemeth to me, unanswerable, as it is shameful to behold, and they confound me exceedingly in his behalf.

27. But now I shall pass to another short view; to wit, how he answereth certain notorious untruths objected against him in Father Persons's book, entitled the "Warn-word;" unto which Mr. Sutcliffe made a solemn reply, entitling the same "A Full and Round Answer," as before hath been said, for that I remember to have observed in the said "Warn-word" certain apparent falsities objected to Mr. Sutcliffe, which I desired greatly to see how he could answer. And for that cause, as soon as ever I could get his said book of "Full and Round Answer," I began to examine what answer he had given thereunto. But when I had gotten it, it cost me a deal of labour to find it out. For whereas the "Warn-word" proceedeth very orderly in examining two encounters of the eight, which in a former treatise were handled by Sir Francis Hastings; the first whereof was, *Whether England had received blessings or cursings, benefits or hurts, by the change of Catholic religion*; the second, *Whether Catholics do hold certain absurd grounds, rules, and maxims of religion*, which Sir Francis Hastings objected unto them; I found that Mr. Sutcliffe had changed the whole order of all in his answer, dividing the same into three several books: the first in praise of Queen Elizabeth's government; the second in setting out the miserable estate of Papists under the Pope; the third in crimination of Father Persons. So as all the order of the former treatise being altered, I could not tell where to seek solution of my doubts. And when I had sought much I found nothing, for neither was there any table of the chapters, or of the matter in general or particular, or any other direc-

Mr. Sutcliffe's
"Full and
Round An-
swer," pub-
lished A.D.
1604.

How Mr. Sut-
cliffe answereth
other imputa-
tions of falsi-
ties by Father
Persons.

tion to find any thing; so as it seemed to me a plain shift and device, to the end he might not be found out. Yet at last, very near the end of the book, I found a certain chapter entitled thus: *Persons's vain clamours and idle objections rejected*; where, underhand, very shortly and obscurely, I found some few words spent, or cast out rather, against untruths objected unto him, which ought to have been handled both largely, publicly, and in their due places. But as there they are couched we shall touch some of them, and thereby see his art in discharging himself of such charges.

28. In the "Warn-word," Second Encounter, fol. 55 and 56, he is charged with two notorious lies made in the page 40 of his "Reply to the Warn-word;" where, going about to prove that Catholics hold ignorance to be the mother of devotion, he writeth thus: *I say, therefore, that it is most true which Sir Francis doth object, that the Papists do hold ignorance to be the mother of devotion. Doctor Cole, a man of no obscure note among them, did openly, in a certain disputation at Westminster, affirm it, saying, I tell you ignorance is the mother of devotion. Neither is he singular in this point, for Hosius saith, "that ignorance is not only worthy pardon, but reward also."** And in another place he affirmeth that it is sufficient for a man to believe that which the Catholic Church believeth.

29. Upon which words four or five untruths are convinced against Mr. Sutcliffe: the first, that he chargeth falsely Dr. Cole, without any proof or any witness at all, to have said ignorance to be the mother of devotion; for that albeit some ignorance or lack of knowledge of some things may be profitable, according to the apostle,† saying, *Dico vobis non plus sapere quàm oportet sapere*—"I say unto you, you ought not to seek to know more than you ought to know," &c.; and that in some people simplicity and lack of much knowledge may give occasion of increase of their devotion, by reason of fewer distractions than the more learned have; yet no learned man did ever

* Hos. l. 2, Adversus Proleg. Brentii, fol. 71. [Sutcliffe's reference.]

† Rom. xii. 3.

say absolutely that *ignorance is the mother of devotion*. And Mr. Sutcliffe is required to bring forth his proof, which he can never do, and so is convinced in this first of a false accusation. The second untruth objected unto him is more perspicuous: first, for that Hosius hath not these formal words, which Mr. Sutcliffe setteth down here in a different letter, viz. *That ignorance is not only worthy pardon, but reward also*; but these other only, out of the ancient holy father St. Hilary:* *Non tam veniam, quam præmium habet, ignorare quod credas: quia maximum fidei stipendium est sperare quod nescias*—"Not to know that which you believe (saith St. Hilary) hath not only pardon but reward, for that the greatest reward of faith is to hope for that thou knowest not;" which St. Hilary meaneth, according to the sense of St. Paul when he defineth faith to be,† *rerum non apparentium*—"of things that are not apparent to our senses and human reason." Here, then, two falsifications more are noted: the one in making Hosius to say that which he doth not; and the other in concealing that Hosius citeth the sentence out of St. Hilary, with the quotation in the margin, and alleged it not as his own, but the very words of the father himself, which Mr. Sutcliffe could not but see, and did wilfully suppress.‡

* Hilar. l. 8, De Trinitate, initio.

† Hebr. xi.

‡ [The following outline of the passage of Hosius, referred to in the preceding page, may be useful for the more complete vindication of that excellent writer. The cardinal is arguing against Brentius's assertion, that it is the duty of each one to satisfy himself by the exercise of his private judgment that the Gospel which he follows is the true Gospel of Christ. In opposition to which assertion, he contends that every individual in the great mass of mankind (e vulgo quivis) is not required to know, still less to pass a judgment upon, every point of doctrine. He instances the multitude whom the Pharisees scorned as "not knowing the law" (John vii.), out of which multitude nevertheless many were saved, and out of which our Lord chose his apostles. Next, after referring to 1 Cor. i. 27, he quotes St. Augustine and St. Irenæus, who commend the faith and dutifulness of the unlettered man as preferable to presumptuous knowledge and a disputatious temper. To these he subjoins St. Hilary, reciting the words given above, *Habet non tam veniam quam præmium, &c.* In the following sentence he collects "the judgment of these learned fathers." *Tantum abest ut ii præstantes doctrina viri, judicandi potestatem de causa fidei vulgo tribuendum esse putaverint, ut ejus etiam ignorantiam non venia modo, verum etiam præmio dignum esse judicaverint.* He then repeats his assertion that every one of the common people is not

30. Two other frauds in like manner are discovered in the second sentence ascribed to Hosius, *Nihil scire est omnia scire*—"To know nothing is to know all things;" for they are not Hosius's words at all, but these alleged out of Tertullian, in his book *de Prescriptionibus*, where he talking *de regula fidei*, "of the rule of faith," saith: *Nihil ultra scire, omnia scire est**—"To know nothing beyond (this rule of faith) is to know all things;" where *ultra*, you see, ^{Mr. Sutcliffe} is fraudulently left out by Mr. Sutcliffe, ^{hardly pressed.} principally declared the meaning of Tertullian; and then is concealed also, as in the former, that Hosius allegeth them † out of Tertullian, citing him also in the margin, as he did St. Hilary before. So as here five falsities are objected to Mr. Sutcliffe in this place, which I greatly desired to see how he would answer in his book entitled "A Full and Round Answer," for that the

bound to know *all* the mysteries of faith. It is charity that is indispensable for all: and this (as Clement of Alexandria has said) may be learned without books. Upon this he proceeds to give a summary of what Christians of this class may be expected to know; and allows salvation even to such as have not completely mastered all the several points he has enumerated, provided they know and believe certain leading tenets which he proceeds to specify: fortifying his assertion with the authority of St. Augustine and of St. Gregory. (De legit. jud. rer. eccl. l. 2, Confut. Proleg. Brentii, fol. 234. Ed. 1566.) Sutcliffe, who has extracted matter of accusation from this passage, might with equal reason and more plausibility have carped at the words of St. Augustine which are found in the same page: *Turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, sed credendi simplicitas tutissimam facit*.—Cont. Epist. Fundam. c. 4.]

* [Walsingham, perhaps, found the word *ultra* in his copy of Hosius. The edition of 1566 omits it: a circumstance which may exonerate Sutcliffe from the charge of fraudulent suppression. The word (or its equivalent), however, is necessary to the passage, as the context shews. The genuine reading is *ADVERSUS REGULAM* (i. e. the Creed) *nihil scire, omnia scire est*; as it stands in Rigaltius's edition, p. 270, and that of Venice, in 1746. Here again Sutcliffe should have directed his charge not against Hosius, but against the father whom he quotes.]

† Hosius, lib. De Fide et Symbolo, cap. 14. [Page 10. Ed. 1566. Hosius supposes the case of a man of dull capacity; and declares salvation to be attainable by him on condition of his "knowing Christ and Him crucified" (1 Cor. ii. 2), and believing the Holy Catholic Church. For, he observes, it is not the most learned, but the most godly that is nearest the kingdom of heaven. And he follows up the remark by commending the saying of Tertullian, "Ignorare pleraque melius est ne quid quod non debeas noris, quia quod debeas nosti. Fides tua, dicit Christus, te salvum fecit: non exercitatio scripturarum. Nihil scire, omnia scire est." He quotes several other fathers who speak to the same effect.]

fraud seemed so wilful as I could not imagine what he would say thereunto. And if he answer it fully and roundly in this point, I should think much hetter of him and his ability; but, after much search, I discovered at length a certain answer of his, where it lay hidden in a certain obscure corner of a chapter toward the end of his book, nothing appertaining to that matter. And it was this.

31. *In my "Reply" (saith he) I alleged two places out of Hosius: the first, where he saith, That ignorance is not only worthy pardon, but reward also; the second, where he saith, To know nothing is to know all things: these places, I do say, as he useth the matter, are Hosius's own, and not Hilary's or Tertullian's.** So he. Where, besides the misalleging and corrupting of the words, as you have seen, he maketh these two sentences to be Hosius's own, *by his manner of using them*; for that he saith that Hosius applieth them to another intent than the authors meant them.† And why, then, had he not said this at the first? Or,

* Round Answer, 337.

† [An opportunity here presents itself of supplying an omission in a foregoing part of this work in the way of corroboration of Walsingham's vindication of Hosius from the slanders of Jewell, and rectification of a mistake which occurs in the course of it, although that mistake does not affect our author's argument, as will be seen presently. The reader's attention is directed to the passage (p. 192—198), where he will find the Cardinal taxed with uttering both "dissemblingly, cunningly, and under another's guise," as also "openly and repeatedly in his own character," language most offensively contumelious to the Holy Scripture. This accusation Jewell professes to substantiate by a reference in a general way to a treatise extending to forty folio pages, entitled *De Expresso Verbo Dei*. Walsingham sufficiently meets the charge by citing (p. 195) the reverential terms in which the accused speaks of the sacred volume, and shewing that the profaneness of Zuinkenfeldius, which Hosius regards with just abhorrence, has been fraudulently transferred to Hosius himself. This justification he makes demonstratively evident by his extracts from the treatise *On Heresies*, where the same train of observations, the same respectful tone on the subject of the Bible, the same precaution against misconstruction of his words, the same indignant denunciations of the pretenders to inspiration and scornors of the written word, may be remarked, as in the treatise appealed to by Jewell. Walsingham is incorrect in denying that certain words rehearsed by Jewell are to be found in this last-mentioned treatise, and hence supposing that he took them from the English translation of the former (p. 196). The words occur in both treatises; and a comparison of the Latin text of Jewell with that of Hosius will be sufficient to shew that the first-named writer quoted from the book which he specified in

why had he not named at least St. Hilary and Tertullian before, as authors of those sentences which he ascribed

his margin, if not from it exclusively. But this mistake is of little consequence. Upon the main question of Jewell's honesty or dishonesty the reader will be enabled to form a determinate conclusion, after reading the following extracts from the two works, which have so close a resemblance with each other in the handling of the same topic: the extravagance of the followers of Zwinkensfeld. To begin with the earlier of the two: (fol. 216 b.) *Excogitavit et ipse (Suenkfeldius) novam hèresim, ac scripturarum nixus præsidio, scripturis auctoritatem omnem abrogare conatus est. Sic ENIM LOQUITUR CUM SUIS: Non oportet legis aut scripturæ esse peritum, sed a Deo doctum. Etiam si milles percurreris Bibliorum lectionem, tamen non nisi scripturæ peritus evades, et nunquam a Deo doctus. Vanus est labor qui scripturæ impenditur: scriptura enim creatura est. Non convenit Christiano nimium creaturæ addictum esse. Deum audire oportet: hujus voces de cœlo expectandæ sunt ut erudiant. . . . Equè nos docet hodie, atque olim Patriarchas et Prophetas, visionibus, somniis attendendum; illis enim loquitur nobis Deus. Vox Dei recte docet, scriptura non est verbum Dei, sed mortua tantum litera, et inter alias creaturas reputanda, &c. &c.* The men who uttered these impieties were no doubt "moved with the spirit of Marcion and Montanus." Who were they? Zwinkensfeld and his party: whose fanaticism the cardinal here traces up to Thomas Muncer, and whose extravagances he is denouncing to King Sigismund, as the consummation, under the direction of Satan, of the work begun by Luther. *Vide pientissime Rex, quo tandem isti rem perduxerint. . . . Sic quod evangelium per Lutherum orsus est Sathanas, absolvit per Suenkfeldium. . . . Scripturas canonicas usque adeo dignitate sua prorsus omni spoliatas [videmus] nihil at iis fidere jubeamur, &c.* There is surely no "dissembling and hiding" here: let us now exhibit the context of the passage which Jewell has cited from the later treatise. It runs completely parallel. The Cardinal has been tracing the course of religious innovation downward from Luther to Zuingle, from Zuingle to Calvin, and pointing to the conflicting doctrines of the Reformers, and to the pretensions advanced by each one to be the correct expounder of Scripture. Now Zwinkensfeld, or his fellow *visionaries*, he continues, hence took an argument in their own favour; and boldly casting off the yoke of these arrogant and capricious teachers, who, whilst struggling with one another not in behalf of *scripture* doctrine but in behalf of their *own*, would have men prostrate their understandings at their feet, declared that *they* "would bid away with the Scriptures, reverently receive as God's word what *He* should reveal, hearken to what the Lord spoke in them (Ps. lxxiv.), and not place their salvation in those bare elements which they saw applied in the most opposite directions." Nos verò Dei de cœlo sententiam potius expectabimus, . . . ipsas scripturas . . . facessere jubebimus, &c. Then follows a repetition, word for word, of the maxims before quoted: *Non oportet legis, &c.; Vanus est labor, &c. Equè nos docet hodie, &c.*, with a similar appeal to the King: *Vides, pientissime Rex, quo tandem res reciderit; and a similar protestation as to the holiness and divinity of the Scriptures: Sacrosanctæ sunt scripture, nec dubium est in illis verbum Dei contineri, si sanus earum sit intellectus; with a repeated declaration that, between Catholics and such separatists as boast of having the Bible on their side, there is no dispute about the scripture, but about the sense of it. Nulla cum iis qui discesserunt a nobis . . . de scriptura nobis est disceptatio, verum de sensu tantum. (fol. 328.)*—Such is the passage

to Hosius? forsomuch as Hosius citeth them by name, and allegeth their words as they stand in their books. Is not this manner of shuffling and shifting a grievous charge of manifest and palpable fraud? This is intolerable in a man that professeth truth. For here he could not be ignorant that these speeches were not of Hosius, but of the two named ancient authors, and their sense and meaning is clear, which being against his purpose, he found no better means, as it seemeth, to avoid them, than to conceal the true authors, and to scoff at the speech under the name of Hosius.

32. And with this I will stay myself in this place and pass no further, pretermittting many other such like charges made upon Mr. Sutcliffe by his adversary, in his book of "Warn-word," and as weakly satisfied by him, in my opinion, as these which I have touched, having taken hereby a scantling of his manner or method of clearing himself from such accusations as in this behalf are everywhere made against him, which I see to be such, as I hold it no mastery for him to answer all comers in this kind of fencing. For whatsoever is objected or proved against him may be rejected with this facility that he hath in shifting matters off with the forementioned sleights and evasions. Wherefore, being cloyed now and somewhat distracted with this vein of his, I resolved to give over for the present this manner of search about false or true dealing, being strongly impressed with that which already I had read and examined, to wit, that the spirit of true dealing remained not on the Protestants' side, which did greatly shake also with me the credit of their whole cause, though yet I would not resolve wholly to leave them until I had used some further diligence, which afterward I shall declare more in particular; only I must here say, that among all

The conclusion of this search into Mr. Sutcliffe's works.

which the author of the "Apology of the Church of England" has made subservient to his purposes—blackening the reputation of one of the greatest ornaments of the age with imputations the most odious, as well as most wanton; persisting in the calumny after reiterated admonition; and outfacing even the exposure of his base dealing by ascribing "craft and disguise" to the words he was proved to have abused, and improving upon his treachery by a new and more daring slander.]

other motives gathered out of the view of English Protestant writers, none moved me so much, after Mr. Jewell himself, as the consideration and examination of Mr. Sutcliffe's writings, in regard of their lightness and small care of exact truth in any thing, as to me it seemed. And so I cast them from me, with some grief and disdain that I had lost so much time in perusing them.

CHAPTER X.

Of the Journey which I was forced to make; and, first, how by that means I came acquainted with a certain Old Man that gave me much light in many things, with certain Notes for the profitable reading Books of Controversy; and of the Conferences that I had with him about my Doubts and Difficulties.

AND now, being arrived hitherto in reading and examining of books, there fell out a certain forcible occasion of interrupting this course for a time, by necessity of a large journey that I was to make, in which journey many matters happened unto me, overlong to be mentioned here; and, among other things, when I came to my way's end, I fell acquainted, by means of friends, with a certain old man of the Roman religion, who seemed to me, upon further conference, not only to be learned, but also to have been in times past in the very same state and condition of perplexity and doubtfulness of mind wherein I found myself now; and so much the more it gave me encouragement to deal freely and frankly with him. Whereupon, after acquaintance made and security taken on both sides for friendly and confident dealing, and that nothing which I should say to him or he to me should be prejudicial unto either of us or obnoxious to the laws (for of this, both of his part and mine, divers friends had assured us beforehand), he seemed to take great compassion of my case, and required me to utter unto him plainly what state I was in, and what had passed with me hitherto.

2. Hereupon I began (though somewhat reservedly) to tell him some particulars; but, afterward finding indeed that he dealt really with

*My first speech
with the old
man.*

me, I opened unto him largely the whole story and narration in effect of all that hitherto I have set down : as, namely, how, being first resolute and fervent in my religion learned in my youth (which was that of the Protestants), I fell upon a certain book, entitled "The Defence of the Censure," written against Mr. Charke and Mr. Hanmer, ministers ; and, having conceived many doubts by reading thereof, I was moved at length (after other sorry means attempted for my satisfaction) to make my humble repair unto his Majesty, as head of the church, and to whom I had taken divers oaths of obedience in spiritual affairs before ; and that by his Majesty I was remitted to the Lord Bishop of Canterbury, and had sundry conferences with him and his chaplain, and sundry other learned men assigned by him ; read also sundry books which his lordship appointed me, and that, finally, receiving no sufficient contentment of mind or satisfaction of my judgment in the doubt conceived, I resolved upon another mean, which was to read more store, both of Protestant and Catholic books, with greater attention than I had done before, especially to try out one point which greatly held me in suspense, whether part did deal more truly and sincerely in alleging authors and testimonies for proof of their opinions.

3. And so having gone over a great part of sundry chief Protestant writers, as well extern as domestical, namely, Mr. Luther, Mr. Calvin, Mr. Jewell, and some others, I found more matter of doubt and distrust than before, but much more after I had passed to the other side of the Roman writers, to see whether they also had the like defects of truth and sincerity in their writings, which I thought best to try by examining what untruths Protestant writers, namely, Mr. Jewell and Mr. Sutcliffe, had objected against them, and how they could prove their objections to be true and substantial ; which being done, I found such difference between both sides as had infinitely afflicted me : all which points I recounted unto him at large with sundry circumstances, which I thought not fit or necessary to put in writing. And, further, I told him the state of my very soul, how troubled I was in my judgment and

reason about the matters which I had examined; and yet how fearful to make any change in religion for many respects, which he might partly imagine. And, finally, I let him understand that I felt such a war between my understanding, will, and affection, as I could not tell well what to do, but had resolved to go forward in reading more books, both of the Protestant and Papist sides.

4. Here the old man interrupted me, saying, that the word Papist was not a fit term to express their party in religion, and therefore not to be used in this conference, being a device only of such as first opposed themselves against the Pope, and thereby would make the word Papist odious; whereas it is indeed (saith he) a most honourable thing for men to stand with their head, and to have their denomination from him. And therefore, saith he, if we shall talk and treat without offence one of the other, let us so proceed that as we grant to you and yours the new particular name of Protestant (which yourselves chose at the Diet of Ausburgh, in Germany, not fully yet fourscore years gone, thereby to be distinguished from us, with whom you had been united before), so let us remain with our old general name of Catholics, which our church hath possessed time out of mind, and so we shall proceed distinctly, and better understand one the other. Whereunto I easily gave consent, forsomuch as now both names were well known, and I was not desirous to contend with the old man about names, but to have his opinion in greater matters; especially forsomuch as I had of myself used often the name of Catholic for their part before, following therein the common received difference of speech between them.

5. Wherefore, having given him satisfaction in this, I returned to my former narration, and recounted unto him more in particular what accidents had fallen out unto me; where and with whom I had been, what I had done, what I had thought, what I had discoursed with myself, and what I had read and sought, what I had found, and in what perplexity I was to see myself entangled in mind, as for the present I was. For that having found so many

things so contrary to my expectation, and former opinion of men and matters, as I had done, by looking into their writings, I could not tell what to think or what to say, and much less what to do or resolve; but yet, very loath to break off this search wholly, and yet more loath to make such a resolution of change in religion as many reasons seemed to induce me unto. And, therefore, I said I meant to take a mean way between both, which was to suspend my judgment for some more time, and to continue my search and reading of books in the same manner as I had done before.

6. All which being heard by the old man, he, smiling, told me that he knew where the end would be; but yet seemed not wholly to dislike my determination to read and search further, though he told me that it was a long way about, and subject to many stumbling-blocks, and not sufficient, secure, or possible for all men; notwithstanding, if I would do it profitably and to the true quieting of my conscience indeed, he said it was necessary I should observe certain notes and animadversions about the manner of my reading, which he had partly fallen upon in his younger years, when his case perhaps was not far unlike unto mine; but much more had observed them since that time by longer use and experience in such affairs. Whereof I accepted willingly, and desired him to let me know what they were, for that I was earnestly set upon the matter, my soul being in the state whereof King David speaketh, *Anima mea turbata est valdè*, and I apprehend (said I) that the very state of my salvation doth depend much upon the event of this search.

The first note
of the old man,
about profitable
reading books
of controversy.

7. Whereunto he answered, saying: "And that is the very first advice of all that I was to give unto you (but I see God hath prevented me), that you should apprehend this matter as a point of singular moment and importance, and not read lightly, either for curiosity, as many do, or negligently, for recreation or to pass the time, nor with the spirit of contradiction, to find out faults whereon to quarrel without just occasion; but sincerely and in conscience, making God himself the judge, and proposing for that end the

only knowledge and finding out of this truth for your direction and instruction, and his glory and service: for that by this way you shall, as it were, oblige him to give you light and assistance to discern the same. And you must make account (quoth he) that if the true comprehension or error in any one principal article in controversy between us doth draw with it the peril of everlasting damnation, if we miss therein; how much more in them altogether, whereof you intend to make judgment by this your reading; for which cause you have great need to stand attent, be humble, devout, indifferent, pray much, and be earnest with God to enlighten you in this behalf. And this is the first advertisement, whereof in effect all the rest dependeth.

8. "Another is, that when you begin to read ^{The second note.} about any controversy, you endeavour first to apprehend well and briefly the true state of the question, not believing one side only, but searching out what each side saith and holdeth therein; for that in this point, above others, you shall find fraud oftentimes to be used by your Protestant writers of divers sorts and sects, every one proposing the state of the question advantageously, as himself would have the reader to understand it, and not as his adversary doth hold it indeed. As, for example, in the controversy about good works, Protestants propose the question thus: *Whether a man may be saved by works without grace*; which is easy for them to impugn, for that it is false. But the true state of the question is, *Whether by grace, and good works that proceed from grace, and are dignified thereby, Christians be saved?* And so in all the rest, if you be vigilant, you shall find fraud used commonly in proposing the true state of the question in some untrue sense and meaning. And, though I could here allege you almost infinite particular examples; yet, for avoiding prolixity, I think best to remit you unto three particular Protestants, where you shall see it abundantly practised. The one is the 'Reformed Catholic' of Mr. Perkins, who, handling twenty-two articles of controversy, setteth down the state of the question truly scarce in any of them all.

9. "The second is the other minister, Willet's,* book entitled 'A Retection, &c.,' who, taking upon him to answer an imputation of certain notorious lies objected against him, which he calleth slanders, never commonly setteth down the right state of the question: as, namely, you may see in the tenth slander, where the question is, *Whether the mass do promise sufficient redemption to the wicked, without prayer or repentance, &c.?* which never Catholic yet held. The third author is John Fox, who in his 'Acts and Monuments,' printed in London, by Peter Short, A.D. 1596; and in his preamble to the same, page 22, setting down the differences in doctrine between his and our church, is convinced † to have made above one hundred and twenty lies in three leaves, and these especially in this point, about misrelating the true state of the question. Wherefore I would advise you (saith the old man) that this point be diligently looked unto.

The third
note.

10. "Thirdly (saith he), when you have the true state of the question, you must be very careful to hold the same continually in your mind, making often reflection and recourse thereunto, about the discourses which you shall read in your author, considering well and attentively whether they be to the purpose in hand, and do level right at the mark proposed or no, or run aside to impertinent matters, as often you shall find they do, and fill up leaves with things that are far from the principal substance of the question. So as this may serve you as the plummet or square doth to the mason or architect, to tell you whether the building go straight or no. And whatsoever you find that inferreth not or concludeth not the principal point in question, that you must lay aside for the time, though it be otherwise never so witty, pleasant, or probable, until you have considered that which toucheth the purpose directly; for that you shall find many authors, in these our days, who pretending to prove directly some conclusion in controversy, will afterward slip aside and draw you into so many by-matters, as will either confound your judgment and memory, or weary your patience, and thereby make all your reading

* See above, 240—258.

† [*i. e.* proved.]

unprofitable and to no purpose. And this is a kind of falsehood no less hurtful, though not so shameful, as that whereof you complain now so much to have found such store, to wit, of wilful falsifications; for this also is both wilful and witting, the writer knowing well enough that it proveth not his purpose, but deceiveth and abuseth the reader by drawing him to impertinent matters; but yet he useth it either for ornament and some show of furniture, or to weary the reader, as before I said. And the only way to discover this and to avoid the inconvenience thereof, is to recal often to mind the true state of the question.

II. "The fourth note may be to ponder well The fourth
note.
the weight of all such arguments as are alleged. For albeit they be to the purpose and not wholly impertinent, yet may they be weak and feeble, and not able to infer so much as is required. And these may be of two sorts, either out of Scripture or ancient fathers. As for the Scriptures, forso much as not the sound of words, but the true sense and meaning thereof, is that which most importeth, the securest way and most reasonable to assure ourselves of this true meaning, you are to look and consider how the same was understood and interpreted by ancient fathers before these our controversies did arise. As, for example, when we of our side do allege for proof of purging fire after this life, the place of St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians,* *Ipse salvus erit, sic tamen quasi per ignem*—'He shall be saved, but so as by fire;' and the Protestants allege on their side the saying of Solomon—*Where the tree falleth there it lieth*: † no man shall ever find that this latter place was alleged in this sense by any ancient father whatsoever. But for the other to the Corinthians, that it was understood and interpreted so of Purgatory in the next life, may be shewed by the clear testimony of many ancient fathers, ‡ as namely, St. Augustine, most expressly in sundry places of his

* 1 Cor. iii.

† Eccl. xi. 3.

‡ Aug. Hom. 16, in l. 50 Hom.; et in Psal. 31; et l. 21, De Civitate Dei, c. 24, 26. De Fide et Operib. cap. 16; et in Psal. 80; Origen, Hom. 12 in Hierem., et Hom. 25 in Numer. Gregor. l. 4, Dialog. cap. 39.

works; and before him, out of Origen; and after him, out of St. Gregory, and other expositors in different ages. And this may serve for a note concerning the Scriptures, forsomuch as that every man pretendeth to allege them for himself abundantly, and to make his chief stay therein; whereas, being rightly understood, they can make but for one part only.

12. "As for the fathers themselves, when they are alleged by any party, it is to be considered in what age they wrote, and whether that which they say was ever found to have been contradicted or reprehended by others of that age or after them. For that when this is not found, though any father's sentence doth not make a matter fully *de fide*, or of necessity under sin or heresy to be absolutely believed, yet is it a weighty proof that the thing which he affirmeth was so believed by the whole church of his days, and consequently were great temerity to discredit the same; forsomuch as that church being acknowledged by all to have been the true Catholic Church, it must needs be presumed to have held nothing, generally, that the Catholic known church of the precedent age did not also believe and teach; and so from one age to another, both upward and downward, may this demonstration be made, which ought to be a great motive to a discreet man to think seriously hereof.

The fifth
note.

13. "It is much, also, to be considered, when the testimony of any ancient approved father is brought forth, whether it be conform to the rest of his doctrine or no; containing a conclusion purposely treated by him, and not some particular saying wrested from him by violence, as oftentimes your men use to do. And therefore, when the matter is of importance, his whole discourse is to be seen and perused with that which goeth before and ensueth, to see how they hang together. And this I advertise you in particular, that whensoever you see any clear or pregnant authority of any one ancient father alleged by your men for their own side, there do you stand attent and examine the place exactly, and I do assure you, you shall find either fraud used in misalleging or misconstruing, or that the place itself, well considered, will answer itself; for that truth cannot be contrary to

truth.* And forsomuch as the same truth in substantial matters of religion was holden then which is held now, the selfsame church, with the selfsame guidance of God's Holy Spirit, having passed down by them and now come to us, these doctors and fathers could not be, in any real point of doctrine, of a contrary judgment either to themselves or to the teachers of our church now, except it can be evidently shewed where and when, and upon what occasion, the disagreement and falling off began. Neither must words of *creeping in* or *secret entrance* of errors be admitted in this point, except the fact may be proved and convinced; for that the church's governors in every age, as they were vigilant in noting the very first and least beginning of errors and heresies in other points, and did both condemn and cast forth the same, so would they have been also in these which now Protestants object unto us for errors and heresies, if they had been taken for such, or had been discrepant from the doctrine of former times. And with the observance of this only note you shall be sure to have all the rank of ancient holy fathers with you.

14. "This also is worthy the weighing—that ^{The sixth} ~~note.~~ your Protestant writers by all apt occasions do seek, as it were by anticipation or prevention, to diminish the credit of the ancient fathers when they shall be brought against them, making comparison between them and scriptures (wherein, notwithstanding, there is no comparison at all), and telling their readers that they are not to be believed as judges in controversies except they bring scriptures, and those, you must think, understood and expounded in such sort as your men like the exposition. And this I doubt not that you have observed already, both in Mr. Jewell and other Protestant authors that you have read, and may do in others hereafter; which is an argument that they have no confidence indeed in the fathers, though for a show they make fair weather for a time with them: and this is one notorious difference between them and us, that when they do allege any places out of ancient fathers sounding to the favour of any doc-

* See before; Mr. Bell, Part 1, c. 8 and 9; and Mr. Jewell, Part 2, c. 5, 6, &c.

trine of theirs that is in controversy with us, if you demand them whether they will stand absolutely to the father's determination in that and all other controversies that he handleth, they will refuse it, but we do not, if it be a matter not contradicted or censured by any other ancient father, or by the church of that time. As, for example, when they allege St. Augustine, as often they do, against *free-will*, and do cite divers particular sentences for the same; if you ask them whether they will stand absolutely to St. Augustine's judgment in this point and in all other points of controversy between us, as *purgatory*, *prayer to saints*, *prayer for the dead*, *merit of good works*, *sacrifice of the mass*, and the rest, they dare in nowise accept thereof: but Catholics have no difficulty to admit the same; for that they know St. Augustine, in his doctrine allowed generally by the church of his days, could not contradict either himself or the doctrine of the same church in our days; and so, consequently, our men may securely join with him in all: and so they do.

The seventh
note.

15. "And lastly, I would advertise you that when you have read all that you can read in your Protestant writers, which you shall always find to be of one and the same spirit in the thing you most mislike and complain of, I mean in false and slippery dealing: yea, and when you have read all the books of our side also, if it were possible for you to read and ponder them all, you shall hardly find any certain rule to resolve upon by your much reading; for that the one saying, and the other unsaying, and the one accusing the other of falsehood and protesting truth themselves, will always hold your mind in suspense. And the controversies be so many, and the discourses so large upon every controversy, and the shifts of them that mean not simply are so innumerable, as in part you have proved,* that it will be impossible for you to quiet and settle your judgment without some more certain rule than reading at random. And albeit it were possible for you that are learned, and studious, and patient of so much labour, and have commodity of books to inform yourself thoroughly in every particular

* [i. e. experienced.]

controversy, by this mean of reading, yet is it not possible for thousands of others who have not these means nor helps. And yet must we think that God hath left some way for them also, both to inform and resolve themselves securely in matters of religion that concern their salvation; of which means, it may be, we shall have better occasion to treat more hereafter.

16. "Now, for the present, I do not mislike your purpose of reading more books, for it will serve at least as a weak medicine that moveth humours, though it bring them not forth; or as the sun in March, that raiseth vapours but dissolveth them not: and so this your reading will serve to fill your head full of doubts at least, though not so soundly to resolve as will be needful to the settling of your understanding and judgment, which God will supply afterward, I doubt not, by some other way; and so do you proceed in God's name to follow the search, by reading, as hitherto you have done; for these are the few notes that now come into my mind for your better direction; and it may be that hereafter, upon further conference, I may think upon more."

17. When the old man had said all this, I could not but thank him for his friendly and careful dealing with me, acknowledging that I had discovered some of these observations in my own reading before, and very desirous I was to have understood more largely and particularly of that compendious way, and more certain, which he mentioned for resolving a man's judgment. And albeit I guessed what he meant thereby, to wit, the resolution of the universal Christian church in every age; yet not to suffer myself overmuch to be pressed that way, I passed over the matter slightly for that present, telling him that I was desirous to go forward in reading of more books, and so we parted and went to bed.

18. But, having thought better that night of the matter, and foreseeing, and partly also feeling that which he told me, that by much reading of books of different spirits, style, and doctrine, I should but increase my own doubts and difficulties, and put myself to more pain and affliction of

*My perplexity
about my con-
tinuance of
reading books
of controversy.*

mind; I began to desire to be informed more particularly of that briefer way or mean insinuated by him of resolving myself by the authority of the church: which desire of mine, when I had well thought of and imparted it with the old man, he said, that he did ever think so that I would fall upon that in the end, or else remain restless. For that it is more easy (quoth he) to gather doubts than to resolve them, as it is more easy to raise up dust than to lay it again. And, moreover, he said that this was indeed properly to seek to be a true Catholic, for that the principal difference between a *Catholic* and an *heretic* is this, that the one embraceth *traditum non inventum*, to use old Tertullian's words, that which is delivered unto him by authority and succession of the church, and not invented of himself, as the heretic doth, who thereof is called a *chooser*, for that he followeth not that which is delivered, but preferreth his own choice, either in things devised by himself or by others.

The folly and temerity of the heretics and sectaries.

19. And by this occasion he entered into another short discourse, but very substantial (as to me it seemed) of the folly of the one and true wisdom of the other; shewing, first, that there could be nothing more fond than the temerity of an heretic or sectary, that will govern himself, in matters belonging to his everlasting salvation or damnation, by his own head, or by some few of that sect which he is of, in respect to the universal Catholic church. And this he made to seem very ridiculous indeed by bringing in the example of some four or five of different sects in Germany, though all against the Catholics; as Lutherans of both sorts, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Trinitarians,* and others; "whereof if you take one of their learned men of each side (saith he), and demand him why he hath left the Roman religion, he presently will say, that he followeth the Scriptures and they not. And if you demand him again, why he differeth from each of those other sectaries who allege Scriptures as fast as he, and do divide themselves from the Catholics by the same reason of Scriptures that he doth, and yet disagree from him? he will say, that

* [*i. e.* impugnors of the doctrine of the Trinity. See above, p. 387.]

albeit they allege the same Scriptures and are copious therein, yet that they do err in the interpretation thereof; and the same will they say of him, and each one of his fellows. And when you come to the proof, no one of them hath any more but his own head, imagination, and opinion, for his ground and assurance; and yet will each one adventure his soul therein; which in truth (said the old man) is a very madness indeed, if you consider it well.

20. "But on the other side (saith he), the man that leaving his own judgment relieth upon the authority and determination of the universal visible Christian church, as commended and proposed by Christ himself to be obeyed, descending down from age to age for a public direction to all, until the end of the world: this man, besides the merit of obedience, deserveth also the praise of highest wisdom; for that to prefer the judgment of so great a number of learned, holy, and virtuous men as have been and be in that church, from time to time, before his own private judgment, is most evident and apparent wisdom, even considered according to the principles of human wisdom, but much more if we respect divine reasons; as, namely, that our Saviour himself hath promised to be with that church, and assist the same with his Holy Spirit unto the world's end; insomuch as the gates of hell shall never prevail against it to bring it into error.* And the apostle St. Paul doth assure us,† that it is and shall be such a pillar and foundation of truth, as we may build and rely upon the same without fear of falling. Which thing the holy Father St. Austin considering, gave this general direction in his book against Cresconius the heretic: *Quisquis falli metuit hujus obscuritate quæstionis, Ecclesiam de ea consulat* ‡—"Whosoever feareth to be deceived by the obscurity of this question (whereabout we two do contend), let him go and ask the Church thereof; which St. Augustine must needs mean of the governors and chief pastors of the church.

The Catholic Roman Church a guide and direction to all mankind.

21. "This counsel gave St. Augustine to Cresconius (said the old man), and the same I do give you, which is a more compendious, easy, and certain way, than to weary

* Matt. xvi.

† 1 Tim. iii. 15.

‡ August. cont. Crescon. c. 33.

yourself by reading so many books, whereof one doth impugn and contradict the other. And you may think that if Almighty God had left no more sure and certain means to find out the truth in times of controversies than this of examining particular books, he had left us and our salvation in a very doubtful and uncertain case; and for infinite people it were wholly impossible for them to be saved; for that some cannot read, some cannot understand, some cannot buy books, some have no leisure, some cannot judge of what they read, and much less resolve doubts that may arise thereon, and yet must all have means to

The means left
by Christ to in-
struct all men
in the truth that
will.

be saved. But by the other way of following the visible church and known pastors thereof, all men may be directed, both learned and unlearned, rich and poor, young and old, idle and occupied. Wherein is seen Almighty God's holy providence and provision for all, leaving no man or woman without sufficient means of direction for their salvation, if they will accept thereof and use the same. And if they do not, they must needs be inexcusable. Neither can there be any other reason more effectually alleged of that admirable and dreadful sentence of the holy apostle St. Paul,* whereby he pronounceth all heretical men to be subverted (and pulled up, as it were, by the roots from all life and nourishment of God's grace), and damned by their own judgment, than this,—that they having so clear and infallible direction left unto them upon earth, as this: *Dic Ecclesiæ*—"Tell the Church of it;" and, *he that will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen and a publican*: yet do these kind of men choose rather to be their own directors, judges, and arbiters in matters of religion, than to subject themselves unto the judgment and direction of this pillar of truth left unto them by our Saviour."

22. And this, in effect, was that which the old man spake unto me at that time, though with somewhat more large discourse; shewing me also, by some examples and testimonies of the primitive church, how, presently after the Christian church was founded, men began to rely upon

* Tit. iii.

her and cite her authority for resolution in matters; as when St. Paul said to the Corinthians, in a certain controversy: * *Si quis videtur contentiosus esse, nos talem consuetudinem non habemus, nec ecclesia Dei*—"If any man will seem to be contentious in this point (and not to admit that which I say), I do give him this resolution, that neither we nor the church of God hath any such custom." Where we see the custom of the church alleged by St. Paul for a final resolution. And the like, the old man affirmed, that I should find in other most ancient authors, that lived in the next age after the apostles: as, namely, Tertullian, in his book *De Præscript. adversus Hæret.*—"Of Prescribing against Heretics:" which, in effect, was nothing else but the alleging of the faith, practice, and custom of the universal visible Christian church from Christ to his time against the innovation of those heretics. The holy martyr and Bishop St. Irenæus, in like manner, in five books written against the same heretics, doth use the very same kind of argument (saith he) of convincing the truth by the authority of the church, as may be seen, among other places, by the first four whole chapters of his third book; where, having first set down his narration of the monstrous false opinion of Simon Magus, Menander, Saturninus, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Basilides, Valentinus, Ebion, Cerdon, Tatianus, and other heretics, risen up in that second age after Christ, he cometh in his said third book to confute them in this order, entitling his first chapter thus: *A quibus et quemadmodum Evangelium acceperit Ecclesia*—"Of whom and in what manner the Church first received the Gospel." His second chapter hath this title: *Ostensio quòd neque Scripturis neque Traditioni obsequantur Hæretici*—"A Demonstration that Heretics neither obey the Scripture nor yet Tradition." His third is: *De Apostolorum Traditione, vel ab Apostolis in Ecclesiis Episcoporum Successione*—"Of the Tradition of the Apostles or Succession of Bishops in the Churches from the Apostles." His fourth hath this title: *Testificationes eorum qui Apostolos viderunt, de Prædicatione Veritatis*

How St. Irenæus convinceth heretics by the authority of the Church.

* 1 Cor. xi.

—"The Testifications or Witnesses of them that saw the Apostles, concerning the preaching of Truth."

23. In all which four chapters (said the old man), you may see in what order that most ancient blessed martyr thought best to confute the heretics (that is, the choosers of his days, immediately after the apostles; to wit, by shewing, first, how the Christian church, now spread over the world, received the Gospel; that is to say, partly by writing and partly by tradition; and, secondly, that heretics did obey neither of these exactly, but made choice of this or that, and abusing them both at their pleasure. And for that there might some question be made which was this church that had so received and conserved the Gospel by these two means, he doth, thirdly, demonstrate the same in his third chapter, by the orderly succession of bishops from the apostles' times to his, which conserved also their tradition; and, lastly, for more certain confirmation of all, he addeth the testimonies also of such as lived with the apostles and saw them in flesh. And then the said holy father concludeth thus (quoth the old man): * *Tantæ igitur ostensiones cum sint hæc, non oportet adhuc quærere apud alios veritatem, quam facile est ab ecclesia sumere: cum apostoli quasi in depositarium dives plenissimè in ea contulerint omnia quæ sunt veritatis: ut omnis quicumque velit, sumat ex ea potum vitæ. Hæc est enim vitæ introitus. Omnes autem reliqui fures sunt et latrones, propter quod oportet devitare quidem illos. Quæ autem sunt ecclesiæ, cum magna diligentia diligere, et apprehendere veritatis traditionem*—"Whereas, then, these things are so great and evident demonstrations (to prove that which we have said), we must not seek the truth from others than from those who be in the church, from which church it is easy to take the same; forsomuch as the apostles did most fully place in the same church, as in a rich treasure-house, all things that belong unto the truth of Christian religion, to the end that every man that would might take from thence (*to wit, from the said church*) the drink of life. Forsomuch as this church is the gate of life, and all others (*that are not of her*) are thieves and robbers, and

* Iren. l. 3, Adv. Hæres. c. 4.

therefore we must avoid and fly them. But whatsoever the church delivereth we must with great diligence love the same, and receive from her the tradition of truth." So St. Irenæus ; which the old man exhorted me to consider and ponder well.

24. And, truly, this place, being read again and again by me, seemed very forcible to persuade me to abbreviate my course in reading so much by myself (though I told not the old man so much presently), and to take the other way so much recommended here by St. Irenæus of relying upon the church. For I thought with myself that if in that very next age after the apostles, wherein St. Irenæus lived, he made so great account of the succession and tradition of this visible church, as he doth well shew by setting down in the precedent chapter all the names of the bishops of the Roman Church, from Linus, that succeeded St. Peter, unto Eleutherius, that lived with Irenæus, being twelve in rank and number, and that in those days there was so great authority ascribed to the tradition of the church, much more might there be now after more than fourteen hundred years' continuance of the said church since Irenæus's time ; whose earnest admonition here given to take all direction of truth from the said church as from a rich treasure-house, did greatly move me, as did also his strait prohibition not to seek the same elsewhere or by other means ; for that, as he said, all out of her are thieves and robbers ; which words sticking in my mind, I purposed with myself to think better of them.

25. And besides this the old man had before counselled me in this point to read in St. Augustine somewhat more largely and fully what he writeth in many places of his works, and upon sundry occasions, concerning this sure means of relying upon the church, and how the said father, though otherwise never so learned, did himself in all his greatest difficulties and controversies with heretics, and counselled other men to do the same, making this ever his surest bulwark for all kind of defence against the impugnations of heresy and heretics ; for the final determination of all controversies ; as, namely, what books and which are

To rely upon
the church a
sure way to
salvation.

Scriptures, when any question was made thereof; and which are the true originals, traductions, interpretations, or expositions; which the true sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost; and other like difficulties. And to the end I might, by reading of this one only father, satisfy myself fully of his sense and meaning, and thereby of all other fathers of his time about this point, he wished me to bestow the reading with attention of some sixteen or seventeen paragraphs, that are set down in the first book and sixth chapter of a large collection out of St. Augustine's works, entitled *Confessio Augustiniana*, containing in effect all that St. Augustine hath in his large and many volumes concerning the controversies of our times with Protestants. And I gave my promise that I would perform the same. And so taking time for the said performance, I took my leave of him for some two or three days.

CHAPTER XI.

Of the Second Conference that I had with the Old Man ; and what passed therein, especially about that which I read in St. Augustine by his appointment ; and what further counsel he gave me, and answered certain doubts by me proposed.

ALBEIT I had purposed, at my taking leave of the old man, to have returned unto him again within some three or four days, yet did I find so many things to think upon, by reason of the former speeches he had with me, that I could not well put myself in order to talk with him again in eight or ten days. For, first, I went to read over the book, named by him, of *Tertullian de Præscript. adversus Hæreses*, wherein I found so many observations set down by him against heretics of his time, agreeing all so just to the different professors of new religion in our time, as they might seem to have been written now, and not so long ago ; I mean for the matter and not for the style, which easily sheweth itself to be very ancient.

2. Next I took into my hands to peruse the foresaid work of Irenæus,* written in like manner against heretics of the same age, though somewhat before Tertullian, but especially his third book and chapters before mentioned, wherein I found, in like manner, great matter to muse at, sundry points and passages offering themselves very opposite and prejudicial to the cause of Protestants in our days, if we will believe them, as I saw no reason why we should doubt thereof : and consequently I did wonder at myself how I had been so earnest and resolute in times past against many things, as false, superstitious, and

* Irenæus, *Adversus Hæreses*.

wicked, which I saw to be very familiar to the ancient fathers.

3. But principally did I persist and spend more time in perusing the foresaid collection of St. Augustine's works, by Hieronymus Torrensis,* not sparing also to go now and then to read the places themselves in St. Augustine's own larger volumes, and ever found faithful dealing in quotations and allegations; but that many things of good moment I perceived to be left out by the collector, for brevity's sake, which seemed to me to serve no less to this purpose than those which he had cited. And this made me see that he dealt not ambitiously to ostentation, but only that he had care lest his collection might grow to over great a bulk.

4. And as for the particular arguments recommended unto me by the old man about the authority and infallibility of the church's direction, I found it so fully handled by St. Augustine, in many parts of his works, as I remained fully satisfied of his sense, belief, and judgment therein, he esteeming no way sure and secure but that; which was a great cooling to my hot desire that I had before, in going forward to resolve myself by my own labour in reading books of controversy on both sides. For I did evidently seem now to see that no certainty could be gathered by a man's own wit and discourse, except he joined it with the sense of the church and submitted it to the judgment thereof, which church, according to St. Augustine, Christ our Saviour hath appointed to be judge and umpire of all controversies, as well out of the Scriptures as others belonging to faith. And this he proved at large, both in his writings against Manicheus† and to Honoratus,‡ *de Utilitate Credendi*, as also in his book *de Doctrina Christiana*.§ He affirmeth also against Cresconius, and elsewhere, *quòd ex sola Catholica Ecclesia veritas conspicitur*||—"that truth is only seen or discovered from or by the Catholic Church;" and in this he goeth so far as he saith, *Ego verò evan-*

The high authority of the church with St. Augustine.

* Confessio Augustiniana.

† August. Cont. Epist. Fundamenti, c. 5.

§ Lib. 2, c. 8.

‡ Cap. 14.

|| Lib. 2, c. 33.

*gelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesiæ Catholicæ commoveret auctoritas**—"I truly would not believe the Gospel except the authority of the church did induce me thereunto."

5. And, finally, not to stand any longer upon this point, I fell upon a certain devout speech or prayer made by St. Augustine to the church after his conversion, wherein, asking her humbly forgiveness for leaving her in his youth to follow heresies, he saith: "That if Christ, her spouse, had not been infinitely merciful unto him," † *absorbuisset me vorago fallaciæ*—"the gulf (saith he) of heretical deceit had swallowed me up;" and then, continuing his speech, saith further: *Noli decipi nomine veritatis, hanc sola tu habes*—"Be not deceived with the name of truth (which Faustus and other heretics do pretend), thou only hast this truth in thee." By all which and much more, which I found in St. Augustine, I did easily see his mind to be that there is no certainty or security in matters of faith, but by the direction of the visible Catholic and universal Christian church in every age. Whereupon I was resolved also, at length, to seek out this church and follow the same.

6. But now for the finding out of this church, and what signs and properties she hath, as that she is only one and cannot be many; that she is visible and visibly dispersed over the whole world, and thereby also universal; that she is infallible and cannot be deceived nor deceive, being assisted with Christ's promise of perpetual presence of the Holy Ghost with her, and consequently can never fail or fall into error; that she containeth not the good or elect only in this life, but also divers wicked, as the barn doth both wheat and chaff; that she hath continued perpetually and visible from Christ to our days by manifest succession of bishops known to the world, and shall do to the end; that there is no hope of salvation out of her, though a man live otherwise never so well and give never so much alms, yea, give his blood, or suffer never so much for the profession of Christ's name;—all these points I found so copiously and

Points held by
St. Augustine
of the Catholic
Church.

* Tom. 2, Cont. Epist. Manich. cap. 3.

† Lib. 5, Cont. Faust. Manich. c. 3.

clearly determined by St. Augustine in the very same sense that the Roman Church doth hold them at this day and Protestants deny them, and the same avouched so constantly and proved so copiously out of Holy Scripture and evidency of logical reason, as I was wonderfully convinced in my mind thereby; and I do remit the reader to the book itself of *Confessio Augustiniana*,* to read the said testimonies, which are large and many, and therefore not necessary nor expedient here to be alleged.

Other heads of
doctrine taught
by St. Augus-
tine against
Protestants.

7. And, furthermore, I must tell you also that whilst I was in search of these things about the authority of the church, I fell upon many other points belonging to the controversies of our days, so effectually handled, disputed, and resolved by St. Augustine† against the sectaries of his time, which was above twelve hundred years ago, and the same also so forcible against the Protestants, that they seemed as if they had been written in these our days;

as, namely, about tradition of the apostles in the church, come down unto us by continual succession, that they are to be followed and greatly esteemed; that the evangelists themselves, in writing the Gospel, did follow tradition; that all things which are to be believed are not in the Scriptures, but many are to be believed by only tradition; and the like.

St. Peter.

8. About St. Peter the apostle, and succession of Roman bishops in that seat, and supremacy of the same see, St. Augustine‡ discourseth and proveth largely St. Peter was *head of the apostles*; that he was the foundation of the church; that he was both *Bishop of Rome* and *martyred there*, and that from him unto St. Augustine's time the succession of Roman bishops continuing, made it a most certain sign of that to be the true Catholic Church.

Justification.

9. About *justification*, St. Augustine§ holdeth *sola fide impium non justificari*—"that a wicked man is not justified by only faith;" which he urgeth so much in divers of his works, as he saith the

* Confes. August. l. 1, c. 6.

† Ibid. l. 1, c. 9.

‡ Ibid. l. 1, c. 8.

§ Ibid. l. 2, c. 5.

epistles of St. Peter, St. John, St. James, and St. Jude were expressly written against that heresy of only faith, falsely founded in the very apostles' time, upon the words of St. Paul evil understood, *that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law*; * which words St. Augustine doth expound at large in sundry parts of his works, there gathered and laid together, and overlong here to be repeated. But all his discourses seemed unto me so fully to agree with the opinions of these of the Roman Church of this day (for of this was my principal search) as I could find no difference at all, though I read twenty-four paragraphs of places of St. Augustine laid together of this only point concerning justification, which contain above a hundred several testimonies of his.

10. I perused also greedily what the said doctor writeth of the necessity of observing the Ten Commandments and of doing good works, wherein I found him to hold expressly, *that the said commandments are not impossible to be kept, and that faith without good works is not sufficient to salvation*: † that the contrary was the heresy of the Eunomians; that there is great difference between the precepts of Christ and his counsels; the former being of necessity unto salvation to be observed, the other appertaining only to perfection.

11. And I pass over here many other points of controversy, which I read very largely disputed by St. Augustine, as ‡ about the sacraments of the new law, their nature and number, the custom of the church in baptizing infants, of the ancient ceremonies of baptism, the sign of the cross, exorcism, ex-sufflations, thrice dipping in the water. And the like of the sacrament of confirmation and chrism; of the eucharist and real presence very largely; of the external sacrifice of the mass, how it was held propitiatory for the quick and dead in St. Augustine's time, and offered also specially for the dead, and in the memory and honour of saints, though not unto saints, but only to God; that it was held

Of keeping the commandments.

Sacraments.

Baptism.

Confirmation.

Real presence and mass.

* Rom. iii.

† Confess. August. l. 2, c. 8.

‡ Ibid. l. 3, c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

for an apostolical tradition, in St. Augustine's time, to offer wine in the sacrifice mingled with water; * that the said sacrifice was *to be offered* upon altars, and only by them that were fasting; and other like points.

Penance.

12. Furthermore, I examined what St. Augustine held concerning the sacrament of penance, † which is very much; shewing that after baptism this sacrament is the only refuge and remedy for sins, which, as he teacheth, are of necessity to be confessed unto the priest, and absolution to be had from him, and satisfaction to be made according to the judgment of the said priest; which I leave to be seen by the reader more at large in the place here quoted.

Purgatory.

13. Divers other controversies I ran over also, as that of *Purgatory*, ‡ wherein St. Augustine is very large and resolute, proving out of the Scriptures the necessity of the purging fire in the next life, and terrifying Christians by setting down the grievousness thereof; and yet that venial sins, and not mortal (except first the guilt thereof be forgiven), be to be purged therein.

Prayer to saints, and for the dead.

Then about *praying to saints, and prayer for the dead*, set fasts of the church, especially that of the Lent, to be an apostolical tradition; § as also the choice of meats upon certain days. The high

Set fasts.

privileges of virginity, the sole life of priests and bishops, institution of monks and religious orders, and other such points of controversy, I found so distinctly and perspicuously handled by St. Augustine, in so many books of his works, and so clearly in favour of the Roman religion at this day, as I began to imagine that the Roman writers could scarce set down matters more evidently for proof of their cause than these testimonies, discourses, and resolutions of St. Augustine do make for them; whereby my admiration was yet more increased of mine own former blindness, folly, and simplicity, that (notwithstanding my often reading over sundry ancient fathers) did think, for many years together, Papistry to be

* Confess. August. l. 3, c. 8.

† Ibid. l. 1, c. 8.

‡ Ibid. l. 4, c. 1.

§ Ibid. c. 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8.

My former error of judgment about the antiquity of the Roman positions.

a new device, and most of their opinions and oppositions never heard of in the old Christian church.

14. Wherefore, coming to talk again with the old man, I could not tell what to say unto him, but only this, that I had read as he willed me, and had found much more than ever I had thought to find; so that now my appetite of reading more and more Protestant books of controversy was quite taken from me; for that I did see that it was but breaking of a man's brains indeed, there being nothing to subsist in,* but a wild wandering field to weary a man's self. Wherefore I told him that now I was ready to follow his advice, and to resolve myself upon the direction of the church, according to St. Augustine's counsel; praying him, that as he had been the persuader thereof unto me, so he would give me some particular advertisements how I might best proceed therein. To this he answered, that he was glad of this my resolution, whereby he did assure me, notwithstanding, that I should not leese the freedom of my own judgment in subjecting it to the church, but rather perfect the same. For that Catholic men (said he) do allow as great a latitude unto their reason and discourse as Protestants can do, though for the conclusion they have far greater helps than the other to make it well, which is the direction of the said church; which direction, besides the multitude of almost infinite learned men that are of that church, being privileged by the most certain assistance of God's Holy Spirit, as hath been said, is a happy restraint, if it be a restraint. For as a temporal prince (saith he), though never so wise, doth not think it an abridgement or prejudice to his wisdom to follow the opinion of his council, though divers of them perhaps be more unlearned than himself, nor have assurance of infallibility in their determinations; so much more may a private man justly subject his judgment to so many hundreds, yea thousands, of learned men that are in the Catholic Church; having this, also, assurance given them by the word of God, that besides their learning, with

My resolution
to follow the
church.

The assurance
of infallibility
in the Catholic
Church.

* [*i. e.* no resting-place.]

prudence and experience, there is superadded also a superior rule of infallibility by the perpetual assistance of the Holy Ghost; whereof unto us that live in these days there is added yet further an experiment also of sixteen hundred years past, wherein this visible Christian Catholic Church having been thus guided and directed throughout infinite tempestuous storms of errors and heresies that have molested the same, yet were they all overcome by her at the last, and her Catholic and obedient children led through all those storms with safety and security of faith: whereas others, far more unfortunate in this behalf, *naufra-gaverunt circa fidem*—"have made shipwreck of their faith," to use the apostle's metaphor and comparison. And the chief reason hereof is, that they lacking this guide and sure pilot, which is the church's rule, could not be constant and firm in any one thing, but ran into variety of opinions, with often changes and alterations of the same, as all sectaries were wont to do: and you cannot, saith he, but remember the note given thereof by old Tertullian in his foresaid book of "Prescriptions," which you said, upon my motion, you had read over, for he handleth the matter most excellently.

The essence of
a true Catho-
lic.

15. Now then (quoth he), if you have fully made this resolution not to follow your own judgment any more hereafter, but that of the universal church, I see no cause why you should not be accounted a true Catholic and of our religion, for that the natural essence of being a Catholic standeth principally in this,—that a man forsaking particular opinions of these or those men, or of particular conventicles or congregations, as also the mastery of his own wit, will, or fancy, doth subject himself to that which the common known universal church, that hath come down by the succession of bishops unto our time, doth hold, teach, and believe. Wherefore, if you have won yourself in this point (quoth he), I see no difficulty in the rest; for that in particular controversies, and the proofs and reasons thereof, you may inform yourself afterward with more commodity. Neither do we hold that all Catholics are bound to know the grounds and

reasons of all controversies, as neither all conclusions and positions in divinity, but it is enough that they do believe them *fide implicita*, as schoolmen say, that is, in believing the church that teacheth them and all that the church holdeth; yet so as this doth not exclude their obligation to know and believe the most principal points; as, namely, the articles of the common creed *fide explicita*, that is to say, expressly and in particular. When I had heard this, I demanded of the old man whether there were nothing else required to make me a Catholic, but only to subject myself to the judgment of the church in believing all that she believeth and rejecting all that she rejecteth? Whereunto he answered no, for matter of faith; but for matter of works and good life, which we hold, saith he, to be necessary with faith, there are divers other points to be performed by you to make yourself a good Catholic.

16. Upon this I demanded him how he could prove unto me that there is no way of salvation but by this means; for that I had often thought with myself, and heard other men also, of good account for their learning, affirm, that supposing the Roman Church were, or be, the true mother church, and consequently that religion good, or at least not so evil as some others do make it, yet that a man may be saved in both religions, for that the Protestant religion seemeth unto them but a reformation only of those defects and abuses which were presumed to be in the other. And therefore, albeit this reformation should pass somewhat too far, and, as they say, launch too deep, and cut off some things for superfluous, or superstitious, which are not evil, yet that all this may be tolerated and excused by fervour of zeal and good intention of the Protestants' behalf; and forsomuch as they agree in substantial points of faith, they may also be saved together, each man in his religion. How say you to this, Sir, quoth I? For as on the one side I would be loath to leave undone any thing which is necessary to my everlasting salvation, so on the other side I would not easily go further than absolutely is needful, nor make any change without precise necessity; for that you

A question of mine to the old man about being saved in both religions.

know what dependeth thereto, for my whole estate of life in this world at least.

The old man's answer.

17. To this demand the old man answered, that for my temporal estate, which I last mentioned, he could say little; but that he thought it both least and last to be considered or esteemed in respect of eternal life in the world to come, depending of the right profession of true religion in this; and that the promises and threats of Christ our Saviour in this behalf, for gaining or losing a man's soul, for confessing or denying him before men, were sufficiently known unto me; and consequently he left that as an irrefragable conclusion which every true Christian man that for any least point of true religion, yea, for any one syllable (as St. Basil said to the heretical emperor's deputy), both life and lands and all other temporal respects are to be neglected. And as for your other demand—whether men differing in so many points of religion as Catholics and Protestants do may be saved together—of these (quoth he) you may well judge by that you have read already in St. Augustine, by your own confession, who affirmeth so earnestly, protesteth, and avoucheth, in so many parts of his works, that no sort of schismatics or heretics (which are such as disagree either about the head of the church or points of doctrine from the Catholics), though he should live never so well, exercise never so many virtues, bestow never so many alms, yea, burn or give his blood for Christ, yet can he not be saved. Which asseveration being so oftentimes made by him and divers other fathers, and never contradicted by any, according to our former note and observation, must needs be esteemed to be the sense and sentence of the true Catholic Church in their days, and consequently of the Holy Ghost that directeth the same.

Whether Protestants have reformed the church.

18. Now, whereas you say that divers do presume Protestant religion to be but a reformation of abuses in the Catholic, and that they do agree in substantial points of Christian faith; first, for the pretence of reformation, it is common unto

them with all other heretics from the beginning of Christianity, who ever began (and must do) with the same pretence of reformation; for that otherwise (retaining the name of Christians) they could have no justifiable cause to contradict the Catholic Church, but only to say that she was out of order, and they were sent to reform. And this is to be seen in all books, fathers, histories, and other authors, that ever wrote against heretics.

19. Secondly, it seemeth a very absurd position that Catholics and Protestants, at this day, do not disagree in substantial points of Christian faith, for that their disagreement being known to be, perhaps in above a hundred points, great and small, partly about the Godhead of Christ, his church, head members and authority thereof, his descent to hell, and remission of sins, all which are articles of the common creed, partly also about sacraments, both of their nature, number, force, and efficacy, about the real presence, the effect of baptism, external sacrifice, mass, purgatory, praying to saints, prayer for the dead, faith and works, manner of justification, and the like, all which are known to be very substantial points; it is (I say) very absurd, and plainly tending to a secret kind of atheism, so often to allege and urge, as some good fellows do, that Protestant and Catholic religion do not differ in substantial points; whereas we read in the ancient fathers, and especially such as wrote by name against heretics and heresies, as St. Irenæus, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Theodoret, and St. Augustine, that many were condemned for heretics by the ancient Catholic Church, and so ever held, for much fewer and far lesser differences from the known Catholic Church than these are, and their eternal damnation held most certain for the same; yea, if it were but a discrepancy maintained with obstinacy in some one only point, whereof infinite examples might be given, but one shall suffice out of the last father mentioned, to wit, St. Augustine, and this in the very last lines of his book *De Hæresibus ad Quod vult Deum*, where, having reckoned up all the known condemned heresies in his days to the number of eighty-eight, he saith:—

Difference of
doctrine be-
tween Catho-
lics and Pro-
testants.

20. *Possunt et hæreses aliæ quæ in hoc opere nostro commemoratæ non sunt, vel esse, vel fieri, quarum aliquam quisquis tenuerit Christianus Catholicus non erit**—

"There may other heresies be or spring up, besides these which in this work are recounted, whereof whosoever shall hold any one cannot be a Catholic Christian." Whereupon I do infer, that if the holding of any one lesser heresy than are propounded in St. Augustine's book be sufficient to deprive a man from being a Christian Catholic, and consequently from all hope of salvation, how much more will so many heresies and sects, as before are said to be between Protestants and Catholics in grave matters, be able to work the same! Especially forso-much as sundry of them also, which are here recounted by St. Augustine in this work, as notoriously condemned by the church of his days, are in the foresaid number of Protestants' opinions, as that of Acrius against prayer and oblation for the dead, against set fasts of the church, and the like; † those also of Jovinian and Vigilantius against the distinction of mortal and venial sins, against fasting, and abstinence from certain meats, against the merit and privileges of virginity, and other such points. ‡

A desperate
opinion that
Catholics and
Protestants
may be saved
together.

21. Wherefore this seemeth to be but a refuge of a very careless conscience, if not devoid of all true faith, to hold that Protestants and Catholics, differing as they do, may be of one church, or saved together: which refuge divers do fly unto, as I understand, now in these later days, I mean of Protestants (for that no Catholic of judgment can ever hold the same), partly, as it seemeth, out of the mistrust of their own cause; partly of sloth and unwillingness to labour for seeking out the truth; partly that having determined with themselves to hold fast the worldly commodities which they possess or hope to have, they would gladly be eased of that care of pursuing § differences in religion, and yet share with us in the reward of the life to come; but this cannot be, as now you have heard, for that there

* Aug. l. De Hæres. ad Quod vult Deum, tom. 6.

† August. De Hæres. 53.

‡ Ibid. 82.

§ [*i. e.* examining.]

is but one faith, one God, one baptism, one truth, and one reward for defence and profession of the same; so as in this I would not wish you to flatter or deceive yourself.

22. Now, as for abuses pretended to be reformed by your Protestants, it is as deceitful a pretence as the other, that every man may be saved in his own religion. For, as, on the one side, no man can deny that in so great a house and kingdom as the visible Catholic Church is, spread over all nations, divers abuses might creep in worthy to be reformed; so, on the other side, we must consider whether the Protestants had authority or intention or means to reform them truly or not. For, first, these abuses must be reduced to doctrine or manners, or both. And, as for doctrine, if there were any superstitious thing that was privily taught or practised in some particular place by some particular men without approbation of the universal church, then was not the admonition of the Protestants in that point reprehensible, if they had made it orderly, that is to say, unto the bishops and pastors of the church, to reform those abuses, which course yet, I think, they did practise in very few places at their beginning. But if the doctrine misliked were generally held by the church, then was it no abuse, but a lawful use; and it belonged not to the Protestants to condemn or control the same, having no authority thereunto.

About abuses pretended to be reformed by Protestants.

23. But if the abuses were about manners and ill life, either in the people or some pastors thereof, then albeit both sides must needs confess that reformation was to be wished and ought to be procured by all lawful means; yet, whether the Protestants did take the right way thereunto by tumultuous impugning, as well doctrine as manners (as at their first entrance they are known to have done), is by indifferent * men discreetly to be considered. As, also, whether in the places they have reformed (not to say deformed), they have brought forth better manners, more virtuous life, more sincere and severe Christian dis-

[i. e. impartial.]

cipline, more abundance of good works, more faithfulness and charity in conversation than was before. For if these effects do not appear, then is it but fraud and deceit to cover all these breaches and broils in the church of God with the cloak of *reformation of abuses*, wherein, for the most part, if you stand attent, you shall find one of these two points commonly to be true: first, that the abuses objected by them, for the most part, are either feigned or exaggerated, or called abuses where they are good uses; or if they be abuses indeed, yet, by disorderly going about to reform the same, it appeareth they have been rather increased than amended, for that the pretenders of reformation were not assisted by God's Spirit to that work, as by the event is seen. And so much of this matter.

The old man's
doctrine and
counsel about
good life.

24. Thus much and somewhat more discoursed the old man about the point by me proposed, whether Protestants and Catholics might not be saved together by pretence of reformation, he assuring me that by no divinity it could be affirmed or defended, but rather that it was a kind of secret atheism and infidelity to believe the same, for the reasons aforesaid. But after this he returned again to the point mentioned by him, but intermitted upon my new demand, that I being settled once in faith by the sure and compendious way of believing the universal visible church, and relying upon her authority (as before hath been declared), there was necessary another care, no less important than the former, which was of conforming my life and actions according to the prescript of the said Catholic faith, wherein he said that there was much more labour and length of time to be bestowed than in the other; for that our evil affections were harder to rule and to be subdued to good life than our judgment and will to true belief; yet (saith he) the Catholic Church with the assistance of God's holy grace doth prescribe also to this matter so many sweet and effectual remedies, as with a little good will and industry all difficulties are easily overcome. Whereat, when he saw me somewhat moved and to de-

sire to know what these means were, he told me that this should be for another conference, counselling me in the mean space to commit the matter very seriously unto Almighty God, as a business of the greatest importance that ever hitherto I took in hand or ever should. And with this we ended our speech for that time.

CHAPTER XII.

Of my Third Conference with the Old Man, and what counsel and directions he gave me for my reconciliation to Almighty God, and conforming my life to the true pre-script of Catholic religion; with the conclusion of the whole work.

SOME days having been spent by me in the cogitation and consideration of the former points recommended unto me by the old man in the end of the precedent chapter, and some earnest prayer in like manner having been offered up by me to the same end, according to the coldness and weakness of my devotion, I repaired again unto him, desiring that he would proceed in that argument, which before he had touched, concerning the manner and particular means how a man that was resolved to strive or contend no more about his faith, but rather to believe and rely upon the church, might go forward in that work and build good life upon this foundation, and thereby receive both rest and peace of mind in this life (which hitherto I had not done), and some pledge, or earnest penny, for everlasting salvation in the next.

2. Whereunto the old man answered, that the way to arrive unto this was already known and set down by the Holy Ghost in these words: *Declina à malo et fac bonum*—"Decline from evil and do good." Of which two members, the first comprehendeth all the means that God hath prescribed unto us to deliver us from sin, either already by us incurred, or for time to come to be avoided; the second containeth the different ways how to do good and exercise ourselves in all kind of Christian justice, piety, and other virtues.

The way of obtaining peace of mind.

Neither doth (quoth he) the Catholic Church prescribe these things only in generality of words, as your Protestants do, but doth come to the immediate particulars; teaching how and when, where and what you must do, and taking you, as it were, by the hand, leadeth you from step to step, till, by assistance of God's grace, you arrive to the perfection of a Christian life, she proceeding in this matter as a true mother indeed with her children, by restraining them first from things that are hurtful and noisome, and then giving them wholesome nourishment and instruction.

3. Wherefore the first clause, of declining from evil, according to the spirit and meaning of the Catholic Church, is, for a man that hath offended Almighty God by sin after his baptism, to be heartily sorry for the same, to seek means to understand and apprehend truly the grievousness thereof, as also the high offence that it hath given and giveth to Almighty God, provoking his just wrath against the offender, and severe punishment in the next life, if it be not prevented by us through sorrow and repentance in this. By which consideration is wrought in us both a great detestation of our sins already committed, and also a resolute and firm purpose to avoid the same and other like for the time to come; so as a man maketh a resolute determination with himself (so far forth as human frailty may, by the assistance of God's grace, be presumed of) never to offend again, either by consent of heart, word, or deed (for by these three means especially sin may be committed) the Majesty of Almighty God; and if, by frailty, he should do, yet to rise again by the same means of faith and repentance, by the benefit of the holy sacrament of penance, containing in it both this wholesome sorrow already mentioned, and the absolution of the church, left by Christ our Saviour to this effect to the pastors thereof, with his authority for binding and loosing of sins, as also the pious disposition of mind, in him that hath offended, to concur, wherein he may, to some reasonable satisfaction on his part for the hurts already done and committed.

What it is to decline from evil.

4. This (quoth the old man) is the sum of our doctrine

and practice concerning the first step of our new building, which is to dig down deep and cleanse the foundations, that a new edifice of good works may be erected, after that the old loathsome rubbish shall once be cast out and removed. And whereas I have named two points here (quoth he), the one of doctrine, the other of practice in this affair, it may be the one is known to you in part by our books; but of the other, which is practice, I suppose you have had little experience; and, therefore, I could wish that you would take some particular time to attend thereunto more exactly; for I do not doubt but that, according to the good disposition of mind which it seemeth to me that God hath bestowed upon you, you will take both great profit and comfort thereby. And if you do not (quoth he), then say that I have deceived you, which I would be loath to have you think, especially forso much as the time will be so short wherein you shall make the trial, whether I have deceived you or no.

*My resolution
to confess my
sins to the
priest.*

5. Hereupon I demanded him, what he meant by this trial and by this particular diligence, which he would have me to use; for I confessed unto him that, having now settled my mind and satisfied my understanding for matters of faith, I felt a good desire also in myself to accommodate my life for the time to come to a more diligent observation of God's commandments, so far forth as by human frailty I should be able to perform. I told him, moreover, that for cleansing the foundations, which he speaketh of, I felt in myself no evil disposition; for that I had resolved now and won myself, as I thought, in the principal point of repugnance, which was, as he called it, sacramental confession to the priest, having read so much and so effectual doctrine touching this point, both in the places of St. Augustine before alleged, and other fathers, concerning the absolute necessity of that manner of confession, as I deemed it a point of great folly to adventure the loss of a man's eternal salvation (if they teach true) upon the natural repugnance which men have to utter their sins to another.

6. You say truth (quoth the old man), you are in a good

way, and I make no doubt but God Almighty will assist you to the attaining of your heart's desire in this behalf; but yet to perform this matter more soundly and substantially, as it is a matter of the greatest weight that possibly can be, I would wish you should retire yourself for some eight or ten days from the common conversation of men, and attend wholly to this matter alone between God, and you, and your ghostly father; for I dare assure you, that you will think them afterward the best bestowed days that ever you spent in your life. Wherein shall I spend them? quoth I. In this very matter which now you treat, said he, of clearing the rubbish of sins past, and laying a new foundation of good works, and a more perfect Christian life for the time to come. But yet, as this may diversely be done with more or less perfection, so I desire much that you should do it, if it may be, in this retired order which I have mentioned. For you shall discover many things thereby, which now you cannot see, and hardly can be inculcated by me; but God himself will teach them you, and that in so clear and sweet a manner as you will afterward wonder at his goodness towards you.

7. But, Sir (quoth I), I would gladly know in particular what is to be performed by me in this retirement which you persuade? Your particular employments (quoth he) in these days are certain considerations or meditations of heavenly things, thereby to make deeper impression in your mind and memory about these two points so much stood upon by St. Augustine, in his meditations and prayer to Almighty God: *Ut cognoscam te, ut cognoscam me*—"That I may know thee and what thou art, that I may know myself and what I am;" for that in these two knowledges consisteth all our happiness. And to come to this knowledge you shall have certain practical directions given you, both by the meditations which you are to make, and counsel of the spiritual father that assisteth you therein. The labour is not great, though somewhat it will be; especially in the beginning, until you be somewhat inured with such manner of mental prayer; for which they will prescribe you ordinarily, if your health will permit it, four or five

The spiritual exercise which is used among Catholics.

several hours in the day ; the one at midnight, the other early in the morning, the third a little before dinner, and the other two after noon. They will prescribe you also manners and particular observations how to make this meditation and mental prayer with fruit and benefit ; how to prepare yourself for every hour of prayer, what and how much to read of spiritual books, how to discourse, how to note good motions of God in your heart, how to discern between the suggestions of good and bad spirits, how to stir up your own affections, how to deal with God in your petitions, and other such particularities, which now you can hardly think of, and they will be both precedents and instructions unto you for your whole life afterward.

8. And for that the whole purpose of these spiritual exercises (for so they are called) do tend to the two main points before mentioned, of declining from sin and doing good, the first days of this retirement are principally bestowed upon the first point, for clearing the foundations (as hath been said), prescribing sundry ways and means how to stir up true sorrow for our sins, by sundry considerations, examples, comparisons, sentences, and precedents out of Holy Scripture, and other such like motive contemplations, which, being seriously and earnestly treated at some more than ordinary length in solitary manner between God and our souls alone, do make far deeper impression than can be imagined by them that are accustomed to handle these things but slightly or in haste.

9. The end, then, of these first days is to look into our own defects, to know our own unworthiness, to detest our own wickedness and propensity to sin, to rue in our hearts that we have offended so good and so merciful a God ; to confess the same, first to his Divine Majesty, as principally injured thereby ; and then, for his sake and in his name, to his servant and minister the priest, who sitteth in his place and hath his authority for hearing, discerning, and absolving our sins ; to make a firm purpose to live more warily for the time to come, by avoiding occasions and other enticements of our infirmity ; to inure ourselves with some sorts of temporal satisfactions by penal works,

whereby our sensual appetites may the better be restrained, and our inferior man be brought into more subjection, so as it dare not again so easily rebel, being put in fear of the severity of our spirit and superior man against him: these, I say, and some such other are the effects of the first day's labour, which spiritual writers do call the purgative part of these spiritual exercises.

10. The other days that do ensue are applied to some other effects; for that having now made up the accounts, as it were, with God Almighty for the time past, we begin to make and follow a new reckoning; wherein, first, we attend to procure a new light and illustration of our minds, darkened before by the multitude and frequent use of sin, to behold the bright face and countenance of virtue in all sorts of Christian piety, which are principally taken out of the most excellent sampler of the life and actions of our Saviour Jesus Christ. Whereunto we are exhorted, both by himself and his holy ex-
Now we may learn the other part, which is to do good.
 amples, and by all good men, to conform ourselves (by imitation) whereinsoever we may; whereby it cometh to pass that we, seeing our own defects, and lack of true virtues for the time past, and discerning, by little and little, the seeds of these most excellent heroic virtues exercised by our said Saviour, and left unto us as a pattern to follow, we do enkindle, by little and little, our desires, and inflame our affections to a new, and far more perfect endeavour to the obtaining, and practising, with the assistance of God's holy grace, of so many of those virtues, some more, some less, as the same holy grace joined with our own endeavour and co-operation shall enable us unto. And this is that *facere bonum*, which before I mentioned, comprehending indeed all sorts of good, by exercising all sorts of virtue, which are incident to a Christian life, than which life (being well performed) no one thing created can be imagined more excellent, consisting of the two parts before mentioned, of *declining from evil and doing good*.

11. For if the former part, which is *to decline from evil*, do comprehend, in effect, that a man is heartily sorry for all the evil that ever he hath done, and that he will never

wittingly commit any more, either in thought, word, or deed, forsomuch as lieth in him, and that the doing of good containeth the exercise of all good works whatsoever that lie in our power; the practice of all virtue, all good desires, wishes, all fear and obedience towards Almighty God, all love and charity towards our neighbour, all justice and equity towards ourselves; if this, I say, be so, as now in part we have declared, what more excellent thing can be imagined than this kind of life, if it be well fulfilled? for inducement whereunto the latter days of this retirement are deputed, and divers rules, directions, helps, and means are prescribed, as well for the attaining of several virtues, as for resisting, repressing, curing, and healing the opposite vices, and instigations to the contrary. Wherefore (saith he) I can say no more unto you, but *veni et vide*, "come and see," and prove a little whether this be so or no; and take some few days for your retirement, and commit yourself to the guidance of some skilful spiritual man for that purpose; and after you have done we shall talk together again, and I hope to find you very well satisfied and contented with your labour and time spent therein.

The manner of
my spiritual
exercise.

12. And now, when this speech of the old man was uttered, I found myself in effect so obliged to follow his counsel and earnest exhortation, as I could not well say no to the same, though I felt some little repugnance, at the beginning, to be solitary so many days together. But afterward my desire increased again to make experience of the thing so much commended; and so I retired myself for some ten or twelve days, leaving all human company and conversation for the time, but only with my spiritual father, that came at certain hours to visit me, talking only of the matter we had in hand, and that briefly also, and with the party that served me and brought me necessaries, who in like manner was abridged in his speech with me, but only such necessary words as belonged to matters of his charge. All the rest of the time I passed over alone in solitariness, and some little desolation at the beginning, which perchance arose out of the novelty of the thing and my

being unaccustomed to pass without company. But afterward, I confess, I found a new world, and felt so many inward consolations and most sweet visitations from the Father of mercies, as I neither needed nor desired more company, but thought myself most happy when I was most alone, and remembering often that saying of Scipio, recorded by Cicero, *Numquam minus solus quam cum solus*—"I was never better accompanied than when I had no company." And methought I did both see and read more of myself, as also of Almighty God, in that solitary darkness (for oftentimes I shut also my windows, for more recollection of my spirits together) than ever I had done before in all the books that I had read over by light. And I found the occasion fit indeed, and very effectual for the two points before mentioned by St. Augustine, *Ut cognoscam te, ut cognoscam me*—to look into Almighty God's omnipotency, everlasting power, mercy, justice, clemency, severity, benignity, providence, patience, love, and other such like excellences, with the contemplation of all the contraries in myself as of myself, and thereby to exalt him most infinitely, and to debase myself most worthily.

13. These things (I say) the opportunity of that time and place did offer unto me, whereby I might much have profited myself if my diligence had been correspondent thereunto. And therefore, returning to the old man again after the days before mentioned, I could not but confess that I was greatly bound and beholden unto him for the counsel and direction he had given me; and that I found the commodity itself to be such indeed as he had described unto me, or rather more; and that I had seen so much thereby, and conceived such purposes for the order of my life to come, as I hoped, by God's holy grace, that they would stay me from ever sliding back again to my former supine and careless manner of living. And with this I discovered unto him certain further designments of mine for better serving of Almighty God, if he should like thereof, which not being fit to be set down here in this narration, I have thought good to pretermitt the same and here to make an end.

14. Wherefore, not to detain thee any longer, good reader, about this my "Search into Matters of Religion," thou hast seen now both the beginning and occasion of my first doubts when I was a Protestant; the prosecution also of the same for attaining some satisfaction and quiet of mind therein, both by other means and by final recourse unto his majesty as head of that church whereof then I was a member. Thou hast seen also the many conferences, and some combats in like manner, which I had with my Lord of Canterbury and other learned men by his appointment, and how I desiring nothing else in the world but some reasonable satisfaction to my doubts and difficulties, I could receive none, but the increase rather of them both by their manner of dealing with me. Whereupon I was forced, as you have seen in this book, to suspect fraud, and that there was no true dealing in the manner of defending opposite parts, but that every side did seek to shift off with sleights and falsehoods, and to bear out their party or faction with what devices soever they might think to be profitable, or available for them.

15. Upon this, being sore troubled in conscience, after some conference with a learned man of the Catholic party in prison, I resolved to make a new search into the principal books written on both sides, beginning first with the Protestants, as Luther, Calvin, Beza, Jewell, Sutcliffe, and sundry others before mentioned; wherein I have shewed how I found so great store of wilful falsities, that must needs be known to be such by the writers (for of these only was my search, and not of bare errors), as I remained wholly confounded at the multitude thereof. And next after this, I having looked into some Catholic books and not finding the like dealing, I thought best to search into those untruths which are objected against Catholic writers by the foresaid Mr. Jewell, in former years, and much more abundantly by Mr. Matthew Sutcliffe in later times; but finding that neither of them, to my judgment, was able to justify any one charge of witting falsity objected by them against the Catholic party, but rather themselves to commit many of that sort in objecting the same to others, I was forced finally, as you have seen, to

change my judgment and yield to the manifest evidence of truth, which I found to be on the Catholic side, and nothing but sleights, shifts, and deceits on the contrary.

16. And this I speak here (good reader) as in the sight of Almighty God, and as in truth of conscience I have found, and no way out of passion or evil affection, or worldly respects; in which each man will easily see how much I do prejudice myself by this new course taken; but that both reason and religion, prudence and all true piety, doth require, that the everlasting salvation of our souls should be preferred before all other human respects whatsoever; which is the true and sincere cause of this my resolution. And this I desire thee, (good Christian reader,) to believe and assure thyself to be most true, as at the last day, when we shall all appear before the tribunal of our Saviour, and all hearts made known, will evidently appear. Christ Jesus make thee partaker of his holy grace, and of the heavenly light of his only saving truth of the Catholic religion! Amen.

THE END OF THE THIRD PART.

A T A B L E

OF THE PRINCIPAL MATTERS HANDLED IN THIS BOOK.

- ST. ALBAN'S relics visited by St. St. German, pt. 3, c. 7, n. 20, p. 424.
- ALEXANDER, of Hales, pt. 2, c. 1, n. 7, p. 124.
- ST. ANTONINUS abused by Mr. Bell, pt. 1, c. 9, n. 7, 8, p. 98.
- ST. AUGUSTINE's (the monk) entrance into Canterbury, pt. 3, c. 7, n. 7, 8, p. 414.
- ST. AUGUSTINE, the doctor, abused by Mr. Bell, pt. 1, c. 8, n. 12, 13, 14, p. 87. Also abused by Calvin, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 6, p. 152. His high authority of the Roman Church, pt. 3, c. 11, n. 4, 5, 6, p. 504. Concerning traditions, ib. n. 7, p. 506. Justification, ib. n. 9, p. 506. The keeping of the commandments, ib. n. 10, 507. Concerning the sacraments of the church, ib. n. 10, 11, 12, 13, p. 507.
- AUTHORITY of the church convinceth heretics, pt. 3, c. 10, n. 22, p. 499.
- THE AUTHOR's petition and request to his Majesty for disputation, or trial of untruths. *Epist. Dedicat.* His delivery of the "Defence of the Censure" to the King, and petition concerning the same, pt. 1, c. 2, n. 5, 6, 7, &c., p. 34. His appearance before the Lord of Canterbury in the council chamber, ib. n. 9, 10, 11, 12, &c., p. 36.
- Item at Lambeth, ib. c. 3, p. 43, His contemplation there in the great chamber, ib. n. 5, p. 46. His third and fourth appearance at Lambeth, pt. 1, c. 4, p. 47, *per totum*. His conference with Dr. Covell, pt. 1, c. 3, n. 3, p. 44. With Dr. Downham, ib. c. 6, n. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, p. 63. His fifth appearance at Lambeth, pt. 1, c. 10, 11, *per totum*, p. 102. His judgment given upon Mr. Bell's writings, pt. 1, c. 11, n. 3, 4, 5, 6, p. 114. His cogitations upon the false dealing of Protestants, pt. 3, c. 9, *per totum*, p. 458. His journey and conference with an old man, pt. 3, c. 10, *per totum*, p. 485. His final resolution to follow the directions of the Roman Church, pt. 3, c. 11, n. 14, p. 509.
- BAPTISM little esteemed by Calvin, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 21, p. 163.
- THE CEREMONIES OF BAPTISM, pt. 3, c. 9, n. 24, p. 475.
- DR. BARLOW, Dean of Chester, pt. 1, cap. 11, n. 5, p. 114. The author's conference with him, ib. n. 10, 11, p. 117.
- CARDINAL BARONIUS abused and falsified by Mr. Sutcliffe, pt. 3, c. 3, *per totum*, p. 329.
- CARDINAL BELLARMINE made a Protestant by Dr. Dove, pt. 2, c. 11, n. 10, 11, 12, &c., p. 264. Most

- odiously traduced by Mr. Sutcliffe, pt. 3, c. 2, *per totum*, p. 307.
- MR. BELL's book of the "Anatomy of the Popish Tyranny," pt. 1, c. 5, n. 5, 6, 7, &c., p. 56. His Antipast, *ib.* His rashness, *ib.* His state and condition, *ib.* n. 10, p. 59. His epistle dedicatory to the Lord Bishop of Durham, *ib.* n. 13, p. 61. His second book of the "Survey of Popery," pt. 1, c. 8, *per totum*, p. 81. He abuseth St. Chrysostom, *ib.* n. 10, p. 86. Also Paphnutius, *ib.* n. 11. Also St. Augustine, *ib.* n. 13, 14, p. 88. Also St. Gregory, n. 16, p. 90. His book of the "Downfall of Popery," pt. 1, c. 9, *per totum*, p. 93. His railing against the Jesuits, *ib.* n. 3, p. 94. His argument against the real presence, *ib.* n. 5, p. 95. His abuse of St. Antoninus, *ib.* n. 7, 8, p. 98. His corrupting of Theodoret, *ib.* n. 10, p. 100.
- ST. BERNARD, whether a flatterer or no? pt. 3, c. 6, n. 42, p. 405.
- BEZA's beginning and progress, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 24, p. 16. His filthy life, *ib.* n. 26, p. 17.
- CALVIN, his beginning and doctrine, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 24, 25, p. 16. Greatly praised by Dr. Covell, and why, pt. 1, c. 10, n. 9, p. 108. His doctrine condemned by Dr. Hunnius, *ib.* n. 13, p. 110, and pt. 2, c. 4, n. 2, p. 148. His false dealing, *ib.* n. 4, &c. His dislike of Christ's fast, *ib.* His denial of images, *ib.* n. 5. His abuse of St. Augustine, *ib.* n. 6, p. 152. Of Peter Lombard, *ib.* n. 7, p. 153. His doctrine about prayer for the dead, *ib.* n. 9, 10, p. 155.
- LORD of CANTERBURY's conference with the author, pt. 1, c. 2, n. 9, 10, 11, 12, &c., p. 36, and c. 3, 4, 10, &c. His angry speeches, pt. 1, c. 4, n. 2, p. 42. His conference about Luther, Calvin, and Beza, *ib.* n. 5, p. 50. His letter to the commissary of St. Alban's, *ib.* n. 10, p. 53.
- CATHOLICS, whether they may lawfully come to Protestant churches? pt. 2, c. 11, n. 23, p. 272. Their plain dealing, pt. 3, c. 2, n. 21, p. 303.
- MR. CHARKE's writings and "Answer to the 'Defence of the Censure,'" pt. 1, c. 1, n. 36, 37, 38, &c., p. 24, and c. 7, n. 2, 3, 4, 5, &c., p. 75. His defence of Luther, *ib.* p. 77.
- ST. CHRYSOSTOM abused by Mr. Bell, pt. 1, c. 8, n. 10, p. 86.
- SIR CHRISTOPHER PERKINS, Knt., pt. 1, c. 4, n. 2, 3, p. 48. His apostasy from the Catholic Church, *ib.* n. 6, p. 51. How he was once a Jesuit, *ib.* p. 51. His counsel to the Lord of Canterbury, *ib.* n. 6, p. 51. His persuasion to the author, *ib.* and c. 11, n. 9, p. 116.
- COSTERUS abused by Mr. Thomas Rogers, pt. 2, c. 12, n. 10, p. 280.
- DR. COVELL, chaplain to the Lord of Canterbury, pt. 1, c. 3, n. 1, p. 43. His book against the Puritans, *ib.* p. 43. His conference with the author about Luther, *ib.* n. 3, p. 45. His counsel and suggestion to the Lord of Canterbury, pt. 1, c. 4, n. 6, 7, p. 51. His book in defence of Mr. Hooker, pt. 1, c. 10. What he writeth there of Mr. Calvin, *ib.* n. 2, 3, 6, 9, &c., p. 103.
- COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE falsified by Mr. Jewell, pt. 2, c. 9, n. 4, 5, 6, p. 229. Also the Council of Chalcedon, *ib.* n. 14, 15, 16, p. 237.
- CRANMER's dealing concerning Anne Boleyn, pt. 3, c. 6, n. 36, p. 402. His consenting to the depriving of King Henry's line, c. 8, n. 36, p. 402.
- ST. CYPRIAN abused by Mr. Jewell, pt. 2, c. 6, n. 5, p. 183.
- "DEFENCE OF THE CENSURE," the first motive of the author's conversion, *Epis. ad Lect.* p. xxiv. Difficulties arising thereupon, pt.

- 2, c. 2, *per totum*. Delivered to his Majesty on Good Friday, at Greenwich, 1604, with a petition, and the issue thereof, pt. 1, c. 2, *per totum*, p. 31.
- DIFFERENCE of doctrine between the followers of Luther and Calvin, pt. 2, c. 3, n. 13, p. 145.
- DISPUTATION desired of his Majesty, *Epist. Dedicat.* p. xx.
- DISPUTATION between the Bishop of Evreux and Monsieur Plessis Mornay, at Fontainebleau, A.D. 1600, *Epist. Dedicat.* p. xix, and pt. 3, c. 9, n. 8, 9, &c., p. 462.
- DEVIL's arguments against Luther's priesthood, pt. 2, c. 2, n. 2, p. 128.
- DOCTRINE of the Church of England agreed upon by their clergy, pt. 2, c. 12, *per totum*, p. 275. About Christ descending into hell, ib. n. 5, p. 277. Disagreement thereabout among Protestants, ib. n. 8, p. 279.
- Dr. DOVE's persuasion to English recusants, pt. 2, c. 11, *per totum*, p. 259. His definition of conscience and heresy faulty, ib. n. 4, 5, p. 260. His cavil about the translation of Scriptures, ib. n. 15, p. 266. Also about purgatory, ib. n. 17, p. 268. His rule to try heresy, ib. n. 22, p. 272.
- Dr. DOWNHAM, preacher, pt. 1, c. 3, p. 63. His conference with the author about Luther, ib. n. 2, 3, 5, 6, p. 64. His book of Antichrist, ib. n. 6, p. 67.
- KING ETHELWOLFE's donation, pt. 3, c. 7, n. 18, p. 422.
- EVANGELICAL councils, and Mr. Calvin's speech thereabout, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 20, p. 163.
- EXERCISE, spiritual, that is used amongst Catholics, pt. 3, c. 12, n. 7, 8, 10, p. 521. The manner thereof, ib. n. 11, 12, 13, p. 524.
- FALSITIES in Protestants, their writings unanswerable, pt. 3, c. 9, n. 3, p. 459.
- FAST of Lent in St. Augustine's time, pt. 2, c. 10, n. 17, p. 252. Fast of Christ disliked by Mr. Calvin, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 4, 151. The prescript fasts of the church condemned by Acrius, c. 10, n. 16, p. 252.
- Mr. FULKE's manner of writing, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 31, p. 20. His contempt of fathers when they make against him, ib. n. 33, 34, &c., p. 21.
- ST. GERMAN's (Bishop of Auxerre) coming into England and visiting St. Alban's relics, pt. 1, c. 7, n. 10, p. 424.
- ST. GREGORY abused by Mr. Bell, pt. 1, c. 8, n. 16, 17, p. 91.
- HATCHET OF HERESIES, pt. 2, c. 6, n. 18, p. 196.
- Dr. HARDING's first rejoinder against Mr. Jewell, pt. 2, c. 7, n. 2, p. 202.
- HERETICS build their opinions and doctrine upon Scriptures misunderstood, pt. 3, c. 4, n. 6, 7, p. 344.
- Dr. HOLDER's writings against Calvin, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 2, p. 149.
- HOSIUS abused by Jewell, pt. 2, c. 6, n. 14, p. 192. His learned works, ib. n. 17, 18, 19, p. 195.
- Dr. HUBERINUS's book against Calvin, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 2, p. 149.
- Dr. HUNNIUS's judgment of Calvin, pt. 1, c. 10, n. 13, p. 110.
- HUSS, whether he was a member of the Protestant church or no? pt. 1, c. 7, n. 7, p. 78.
- Mr. JEWELL's Apology for the Church of England, pt. 2, c. 1, n. 11, p. 126. His challenges at Paul's-cross, pt. 2, c. 5, n. 2, p. 167. Falsities objected against him by Catholic writers, ib. n. 8,

- 9, 10, 11, &c., p. 171. His hypocrisy and dissimulation, *ib. n. 8*, p. 172. His abuse of Scriptures, *ib. n. 17*, p. 177. Of St. Jerome, *ib. n. 4*, p. 182. Of St. Cyprian, *ib. n. 5*, p. 183. His infinite bad dealing in all his writings, *ib. per totum caput, et per totum*, c. 7, 8, p. 201. His combat with Dr. Harding in particular, pt. 2, c. 9, n. 3, 4, *et seq.*, p. 228. His falsifying of the Council of Carthage, *ib. n. 4*, p. 229. His bad dealing towards his Catholic adversaries, pt. 3, c. 1, *per totum*, p. 290. About private mass, *ib. n. 7*, p. 294. About the sacrifice of the mass, *ib. n. 14*, p. 299. About prayer to saints and for the dead in mass, *ib. n. 14*, p. 299. Charged with five hundred and sixty-two lies, pt. 3, c. 1, n. 22, p. 303.
- INFIDELITY of Protestant writers and their writings, pt. 2, c. 1, n. 2, p. 121.
- ST. JEROME abused by Mr. Jewell, pt. 2, c. 6, n. 4, p. 182.
- JOANNES MODESTUS's writings against Luther, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 7, p. 149.
- POPE JOHN XXII. accused by Calvin, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 18, 19, p. 161. Whether he denied the immortality of the soul or no? pt. 2, c. 9, n. 8, 9, 10, p. 231.
- IRENÆUS, how he convinced heretics of his time, pt. 3, c. 10, n. 21, 22, 23, p. 499.
- DR. KELLISON's book against Mr. Sutcliffe, pt. 2, c. 10, n. 3, p. 243.
- LITANIES impugned by Calvin, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 11, 12, p. 158.
- KING LUCIUS's (of Brittany) conversion, pt. 3, c. 7, n. 6, p. 412, and c. 8, n. 6, p. 435.
- LUTHER's first beginning and progress, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 13, 14, 15, 16, &c., p. 9. His spirit of pride and scurrility, *ib. n. 17*, p. 11. His railing against King Henry VIII., *ib. p. 12*. His doctrine, whether of God or no? *ib. n. 19*, 20, 21, p. 13. His conference with the Devil, pt. 2, c. 2, n. 2, 3, 4, &c., p. 128. His eating of salt with him, *ib. n. 12*, p. 133. He calleth devils doctors of divinity, *ib. n. 12*, p. 134. His false accusation of Catholics' doctrine, pt. 2, c. 3, n. 3, 4, 5, &c., p. 139.
- LUTHERANS, whether brethren of the English Protestant Church, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 28, p. 19.
- MASS and real presence, pt. 3, c. 1, n. 11, 12, p. 296, and c. 2, n. 18, p. 320, c. 8, n. 12, p. 439.
- MARRIAGE of priests unlawful, pt. 1, c. 8, n. 7, 8, &c., p. 84.
- MEANS left by Christ to instruct all men in the true way to salvation, pt. 3, c. 10, n. 20, p. 497.
- DR. MONTAGUE, dean of the King's chapel, pt. 2, c. 2, n. 9, p. 36. His speech in the council chamber concerning Luther, *ib. n. 11*, p. 38.
- NAZIANZEN abused by Mr. Jewell, pt. 2, c. 9, n. 13, p. 236.
- NOTES given to the author by an old man of the Catholic side concerning the reading of books of controversies, pt. 3, c. 10, n. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, pp. 488 to 494.
- OBSERVATIONS about reading books of controversies, *Epist. ad Lect.* and pt. 3, c. 10, n. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, &c., pp. 488 to 497.
- ORIGINAL SIN less then venial, pt. 2, c. 12, n. 16, 17, p. 283.
- PAPHNUTIUS abused by Mr. Bell, pt. 1, c. 8, n. 11, p. 86.
- PETER LOMBARD, Master of the

- Sentences, pt. 2, c. 1, n. 7, p. 124.
Abused by Calvin, ib. c. 4, n. 7, 8, p. 154.
- PETRUS CANISIUS's large Catechism, pt. 2, c. 1, n. 8, p. 125.
- FATHER PERSONS abused and falsified by Mr. Sutcliffe, pt. 3, c. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, *per totum*, p. 340. His book of "Christian Directory," or "Resolution," ib. c. 4, p. 342. His "Reasons of Refusal," ib. c. 5, *initio*, p. 358. His book of "Ward-word" and "Warn-word" against Sir Francis Hastings, pt. 3, c. 6, *initio*, p. 380. His book of "Three Conversions," pt. 3, c. 7, 8, *per totum*, pp. 408 to 458.
- Monsieur PLESSIS MORNAY's conference with the Bishop of Evreux in France, pt. 3, c. 9, n. 9, 10, p. 462. Notorious untruths objected to him in that conference whereof he was convinced, ib. p. 463. About the real presence, ib. n. 10, p. 464. About transubstantiation, ib. n. 11, p. 465. About prayer to saints, ib. n. 12, 13, p. 466. About trusting in saints, ib. n. 14, p. 466. About honouring the cross, ib. n. 15, 17, pp. 467, 468, 469.
- PRAYER for the dead impugned by Calvin, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 9, 10, p. 156, and by Mr. Willet, pt. 2, c. 10, n. 18, 253. See pt. 3, c. 1, n. 10, p. 299.
- PRAYER to saints, pt. 3, c. 1, n. 41, p. 299.
- PROTESTANTS, why they refuse trial and public disputation, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 2, 3, 4, p. 3. Protestants hold many old heresies, pt. 1, n. 11, p. 8. Whether they may be called heretics, pt. 1, c. 11, n. 7, p. 263. Their disagreement and stirs at the first beginning of their doctrine, pt. 2, c. 3, n. 10, 11, &c., p. 144.
- PROTESTANTS do falsely charge Catholics with doctrines which they do not hold, pt. 2, c. 3, n. 3, 4, p. 138, ib. c. 3, n. 11, 13, 14, &c., p. 145, c. 10, n. 5, 6, 7, &c., p. 244.
- PROTESTANTS and Catholics not saved together, pt. 3, c. 11, n. 17, 21, pp. 512 to 514.
- PROTESTANT authors that write against Calvin, pt. 2, c. 4, n. 9, 10, p. 157.
- PROTESTANCY begun in this last age, and by whom, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 13, 14, 15, &c., p. 9.
- PURGATORY, pt. 3, c. 5, n. 9, p. 363; ib. c. 10, n. 11, p. 491.
- QUEEN ANNE BOLEYN, her defamation after her death by Bishop Cranmer, pt. 3, c. 6, n. 36, 37, p. 403.
- QUEEN JANE exalted to the crown by Cranmer and the council, in deprivation of Queen Mary, pt. 3, c. 8, n. 36, 37, pp. 455, 456.
- A QUESTION about being saved in both religions, pt. 3, c. 11, n. 16, p. 511.
- RASKAL, a town in Yorkshire, pt. 1, c. 5, n. 10, 14, p. 59.
- MR. RASTAL's "Beware of Mr. Jewell," pt. 2, c. 7, n. 4, p. 204.
- RELICS of St. Alban visited by St. German, pt. 1, c. 7, n. 20, p. 424.
- MR. WILLIAM REYNOLDS's censure of Mr. Jewell's writings, pt. 2, c. 8, p. 219.
- SIR ROGER WILBRAHAM, Master of Requests, pt. 1, c. 2, n. 6, p. 34.
- MR. ROGERS's book of the "Doctrine of the Church of England" examined, pt. 2, c. 12, *per totum*, p. 275. His abuse of Costerus, the Jesuit, ib. n. 10, p. 280. His general heads and grounds of doctrine faulty, ib. n. 14, 23, p. 288.
- MR. ROLFE, Commissary of St. Alban's, pt. 1, c. 5, n. 4, p. 55. The Lord of Canterbury's letter unto him, c. 4, n. 10, p. 53. His referring the author to Dr. Downham, pt. 1, c. 5, n. 4, p. 56.
- RULE to try heresy, both of Catholics and Protestants, pt. 2, c. 11, n. 22, p. 272.

- SABELLICUS's "Decades" denied by Mr. Jewell, pt. 2, c. 6, n. 12, p. 190.
- SAINTS odious to the Devil, pt. 2, c. 2, n. 3, p. 129.
- SCHOOLMASTER's wife, suing for her husband's liberty, being in prison for religion, pt. 1, c. 11, n. 1, p. 112.
- SOCRATES's manner of death, pt. 3, c. 5, n. 19, p. 369.
- SPIRITS, and the different ways to try them, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 6, 7, 8, 9, &c., p. 4. By Scriptures, ib. By express words, ib. By other means, ib. 10, 11, p. 7.
- Dr. STAPLETON's return of untruths against Mr. Jewell, pt. 2, c. 7, n. 3, p. 203. His offer against lies of Mr. Jewell, pt. 3, c. 1, n. 2, p. 291.
- SUPREMACY of the Bishop of Rome, pt. 1, c. 6, n. 2, 3, p. 179, and c. 9, n. 14, p. 237, and pt. 3, c. 2, n. 2, p. 308, and ib. c. 6, n. 33, p. 400, c. 7, n. 9, p. 415.
- Mr. SUTCLIFFE's false charges against Cardinal Bellarmine, pt. 3, c. 2, *per totum*, p. 307. About corrupting the Council of Nice, ib. n. 2, p. 309. About falsifying of St. Jerome, ib. n. 4, p. 310. About falsifying the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, ib. n. 7, p. 312. About the title of the Popes, ib. n. 11, 12, p. 315. About the first author of impugning images, ib. n. 15, p. 318. About the lives of Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, &c., ib. n. 17, p. 319. About the image of God lost in Adam, ib. n. 23, p. 324. About the chastity of prophets and their children, ib. n. 24, p. 325.
- Mr. SUTCLIFFE's abuse of Cardinal Baronius, pt. 3, c. 3, *per totum*, p. 329. About the title and picture of his first tome of Annals, ib. n. 4, 5, 6, p. 330. About licence to print, ib. n. 8, p. 333. About different opinions in chronology, ib. n. 9, p. 334. About the rich glutton in the Gospel, ib. n. 10, p. 336. About the derivation of the word "missa," ib. n. 12, p. 337. About thongs, ib. n. 13, p. 338.
- Mr. SUTCLIFFE's egregious abuse and falsifying of Father Persons, pt. 3, c. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, *per totum*, pp. 340 to 458. His four books written against Father Persons, pt. 3, c. 4, n. 2, 3, 4, p. 340. His false charge of Father Persons (out of his book of "Resolution") about heretics abusing the simple people with Scriptures, ib. n. 5, p. 343. About Luther's opinion of the Sacramentaries, ib. n. 8, p. 345. About St. Antony and St. Augustine, ib. n. 13, 17, p. 348. About the counterfeit writings of Aristæus, ib. n. 15, p. 351. About perverting St. Augustine, ib. n. 16, p. 352. About apparitions to men that lay a-dying, ib. n. 19, 20, 21, 22, pp. 354-5. About purgatory, pt. 3, c. 5, n. 9, p. 363. About extreme unction, ib. n. 6, p. 361. About Socrates's death, ib. n. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, pp. 365 to 368. About Zeno the Stoic, ib. n. 22, 23, 24, p. 371. About the number of infants slain by Herod in Bethlehem, ib. n. 25, 26, 27, 28, p. 373. About the first Christians in Alexandria, ib. n. 29, p. 376. (Out of the "Reasons of Refusal.") About angels present at the sacrifice of the mass, pt. 3, c. 5, n. 2, 3, 4, 5, p. 358. (Out of the "Warn-word.") About Atheism, pt. 3, c. 6, n. 2, p. 381. About the name of minister, ib. n. 3, p. 381. About a preaching dean, ib. n. 6, p. 384. About naming of an interlude, ib. n. 9, p. 385. About Hostiensis, Panormitan, and Cusanus, ib. n. 10, 11, p. 386. About the Trinitarians, ib. n. 12, p. 387. About the word "Homousion," ib. n. 15, p. 389. About the breach of his promise, ib. n. 18, p. 391. About a false alarm of invasion, ib. n. 19, p. 391. About the conception of our

- Blessed Lady, ib. n. 28, 29, p. 397.
 About Queen Anne Boleyn, ib. n. 37, p. 403. About Peter's Primacy, ib. n. 33, p. 400. About St. Bernard being a flatterer, ib. n. 42, p. 405. (Out of the "Three Conversions.") About St. Augustine's entrance into Canterbury, pt. 3, c. 7, n. 6, 7, p. 413. About King Lucius and King Ethelbert, their conversion, c. 8, n. 6, p. 435. About the Britons' observation of Easter, c. 7, n. 8, p. 414. About calumniating the Magdeburgians, ib. n. 8, p. 436. About King Ethelwolfe's donation, ib. c. 7, n. 18, p. 422. About King Edward VI., his being a child king, ib. n. 19, p. 422. About St. German's praying to St. Alban, ib. n. 20, p. 424. About St. Wilfrid, Bishop of York, ib. n. 22, 23, 24, p. 426. About the conversion of Englishmen by Romans, ib. n. 25, p. 428. About St. Ambrose abused, ib. c. 8, n. 12, 13, p. 439. About Constantine's entrance after Dioclesian, ib. n. 25, p. 448. About St. Willebrord's sending into Germany, ib. n. 27, p. 449. About the slaughter of Dinotus, Abbot of Bangor, ib. n. 33, p. 453.
- Mr. SUTCLIFFE's defence of M. Plessis Mornay, pt. 3, c. 9, n. 18, 19, 20, p. 472. His defence against Mr. Woodward, ib. n. 23, p. 474. Against Father Persons, ib. n. 26, 27, 28, 29, p. 477.
- TEMERITY of heretics and sectaries, pt. 3, c. 10, n. 18, p. 496.
- THEODORET abused by Mr. Bell, pt. 1, c. 9, n. 10, p. 100.
- St. THOMAS of Aquin, pt. 2, c. 1, n. 6, p. 124.
- VIRGINITY preferred before marriage by St. Augustine, pt. 2, c. 8, n. 4, p. 221; see ib. c. 4, n. 20, p. 163.
- THOMAS WALDENIS's works, pt. 2, c. 1, n. 9, p. 125.
- WICKLIFFE, whether he were a member of the Protestant Church, pt. 1, c. 7, n. 7, p. 78.
- St. WILFRID, Bishop of York, and apostle of the south Saxons, pt. 3, c. 7, n. 22, 23, 24, p. 426.
- Mr. WILLET's writing against Catholics, pt. 2, c. 10, n. 4, 5, p. 244. His *Tetrastylon Papisticum, et Synopsis Papismi*, ib. n. 5, 6, et seq., p. 244. His false charge about the mass, ib. n. 5, p. 244. His abuse of St. Bernard, ib. n. 7, 8, 9, 10, p. 245. Of Cardinal Bellarmine, ib. n. 8, p. 247. About priests' marriage, ib. n. 7, p. 245. About *opus operatum*, ib. n. 8, p. 246. About Antichrist's chair, ib. n. 9, p. 247. About serving of Antichrist, ib. n. 10, p. 248. About voluntary poverty, ib. n. 12, p. 249. About contrition, ib. n. 15, p. 251. About fasting, ib. n. 16, p. 252. About prayer for the dead, ib. n. 18, p. 253.
- Mr. WOODWARD's book against Mr. Sutcliffe, pt. 2, c. 10, n. 3, p. 243.
- ZENO the Stoic, his speech about one God, pt. 3, c. 5, n. 22, 23, 24, p. 371.
- ZUINGLIUS, his beginning, progress, and conference with the Devil, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 23, p. 15, and pt. 2, c. 2, n. 8, 9, p. 130.
- ZUINGLIANS, whether brethren of the English Protestant Church, pt. 1, c. 1, n. 28, p. 18.

Printed by J. L. Cox & Sons, 74 & 75, Great Queen Street,
Lincoln's-Inn Fields.



B
7'
W



BT 771 .W3

A search made into matters of
Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 041 281 259

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
CECIL H. GREEN LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(415) 723-1493

All books may be recalled after 7 days

DATE DUE

28D DEC 09 1995

28D

MAY 27 1996

28D JAN 06 1996

28D JAN 12 1996

28D FEB 10 1996

28D MAR 06 1996

28D APR 13 1996

28D APR 20 1996

